

LIBERATOR—*EXTRA.*

BOSTON, AUG. 19, 1837.

FOR SALE AT 25, CORNHILL. PRICE 10 CTS. SINGLE—75 CTS. PER. DOZEN.

New Books,

FOR SALE BY

ISAAC KNAPP,

At the A. S. Office, 25, Cornhill.

WHITTIER'S POEMS. Poems written during the progress of the Abolition question in the United States, between the years 1830 and 1838, by J. G. Whittier. It is embellished with a beautiful copperplate engraving, just received from London, illustrating the following verse in Cowper's Morning Dream.

But soon as approaching the land,
That angel-like woman he view'd;
The scourge he let fall from his hand,
With the blood of his subjects imbrued.

Every abolitionist should make this book his pocket companion. When our spirits droop, and our hopes become faint, and our zeal is cold, then let us come and draw new life from this gushing fountain. Price 37 1-2 cts.

GUSTAVUS VASSA, *written by himself*. This is the life of a native African, of powerful intellect, who was 'stolen out of his own land,' lived as a slave in Pennsylvania, went several voyages to the West Indies, and to several ports in Europe, narrowly escaped death several times, and passed through a great variety of wonderful scenes, which give his narrative an interest scarcely surpassed by Robinson Crusoe. Embellished with two fine lithographic prints, 294 pages, price 62 1-2 cts.

J. Q. ADAMS'S LETTERS. Letters from John Quincy Adams, to his constituents of the Twelfth Congressional District in Massachusetts, to which is added his *speech* in Congress, delivered February 9, 1837. Price 10 cts. single, \$1 per dozen, \$6 per hundred.

There is no work which should, at this time, be more widely scattered, especially in Massachusetts. If this does not stir up the yeomanry of the north, to a sense of the fact that their liberties are doomed to become a sacrifice upon the smoking altar of slavery, unless they speedily awake, then will the bloody rite be soon performed.

Important Work.—Just published and for sale at the Anti-Slavery office, a pamphlet of 225 pages, entitled 'LIBERTY,' being a compilation of the sayings of eminent Legislators, Jurists, Moralists, Philosophers, Poets, &c. &c., in regard to human liberty, American slavery, and the character of the enslaved. It also contains a full history of the Texian Revolution. White America is here judged out of her own mouth.

Some gems from this valuable compilation may be found in our poet's corner. The abolitionist may find in this pamphlet what he would otherwise have to ransack hundreds of volumes to find, and perhaps after all search in vain. Price 37 1-2 cents single.—

MEMOIR OF WILBERFORCE. By Thomas Price. 18mo. With an engraving. Let those who would catch his spirit read his life. 25.

**AMERICAN ANTI SLAVERY ALMANAC
For 1838,**

JUST published. Orders solicited from any part of the United States, and promptly answered by ISAAC KNAPP, 25, Cornhill.

Price—\$30,00 per 1000—\$3,50 per 100—50 cents per dozen. No deviation from these prices.

ARCHY MOORE, or *Memoirs of the Slave*. 2 vols. 12mo. This work throws light, in a full blaze, all over the subject of slavery. It should be used, as a flaming torch, by every abolitionist. Price reduced. \$1,25.

CHARLES BALL. 1 vol. 12mo. This is a story, told by himself, of a MAN who lived 40 years in Maryland, S. Carolina and Georgia, as a slave, under various masters, and was one year in the Navy, with Commodore Barney, during the last war. Containing an account of the manners and usages of the planters and slaveholders of the South, a description of the condition and treatment of the slaves, with observations upon the state of morals amongst the cotton planters, and the perils and sufferings of a fugitive slave, who twice escaped from the cotton country. This is a work of thrilling interest, by some considered preferable to Archy Moore. 1,00.

LEMUEL HAYNES. 1 vol. 12mo. This contains sketches of the life and character of the well known colored preacher, who was, for many years, pastor of a Congregational church in Rutland, Vt. He is celebrated for his controversy with Hosea Ballou, which is here given entire. Many of his most interesting writings are also copied. It is enriched with a valuable introduction, by Dr. Sprague, and embellished with a portrait. The profits of the work are devoted to the benefit of his family, who are in indigent circumstances. 1,00

TESTIMONY OF GOD AGAINST SLAVERY. A collection of passages from the Bible, which show the sin of holding and treating the human species as property. With notes. To which is added the testimony of the civilized world against slavery. This is a magazine of fact and argument. Second edition, improved. Price reduced. 25.

"and argument." Second edition, improved. Price reduced. 25.

THOMPSON IN AMERICA. Letters and Addresses by George Thompson, during his mission in the United States, from Oct. 1, 1834, to Nov. 27, 1835. Any man who ever heard George Thompson, or ever heard of him, should have this book. 126 pages, price 37 1-2 cts.

June 16.

MEMOIR OF JAMES JACKSON. 18mo. This is an account of the life of a very interesting colored Sabbath scholar, who died in Boston, Oct. 31, 1833, aged 6 years and 11 months. By Miss Susan Paul. Every Sabbath school library should contain this book. 25.

GODWIN ON SLAVERY. This is an exceedingly valuable work, by the well known author of the *Work on Atheism*. It furnishes clear proof of the identity of the spirit of slavery, and furnishes the American abolitionist with *tried* weapons to use in this holy warfare. 12mo. 62 1-2.

THE OASIS. By Mrs. Child. With 20 beautiful engravings. This is a work of high literary character, and is of great value to the working abolitionist. It was formerly sold at \$1.25, and was cheap at that price. 75.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES, and interesting anecdotes of persons of color, to which is added a selection of pieces of poetry, compiled by A. Mott. 12 mo. pp. 260, neatly bound in cloth. 50

LIFE OF GRANVILL SHARPE. This is a biography of one of the earliest English abolitionists, and should be read by every American who is laboring in the same cause. It is ornamented with an engraving executed by a colored youth. 37 1-2.

APPEAL OF CLERICAL ABOLITIONISTS ON ANTI-SLAVERY MEASURES

--REPLY BY EDITOR PRO. TEM. OF THE LIBERATOR--A LAYMAN'S
REPLY TO A 'CLERICAL APPEAL'--REPLY TO THE APPEAL BY
REV. A. A. PHELPS--DECLARATION OF ABOLITIONISTS IN THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT ANDOVER, MASS.

From the New England Spectator.

APPEAL OF CLERICAL ABOLITIONISTS ON ANTI-SLAVERY MEASURES.

MR. PORTER,--Several individuals, who are known in public and in private as friends of the anti-slavery cause, wish to say, through your paper, a few things with regard to the recent movements relative to the subject of slavery. We are abolitionists in the strictest sense; and such we purpose to be as long as there is a slave on the face of the earth. We have given our feelings, our influence and our talents, in public and in private, to the cause of immediate and universal emancipation. We regard slavery as a loud crying and exceedingly aggravated sin, under all circumstances, and at all times; and we claim that, like all other sins, it ought to be at once and forever abandoned; and we purpose with the help of God, to do all that in us lies, at home and abroad, from the pulpit and the press, to hold up this iniquitous system of robbery and wrong, as worthy only of universal and eternal abhorrence; and to call, in the name of humanity and God, on all who hold their fellow-men in chains, to desist at once from their iniquitous work. We purpose to do with our might all that our hands or our tongues find to do, to hasten the day when the yoke of the oppressor shall be broken, and the oppressed go free.

But, having given our influence, and our efforts, to some extent, to the cause of immediate emancipation, and become, in some sense, identified with it, as we wish still to be, we are not a little grieved at some things, which we see in the movements of some leading abolitionists. Some of these things we will name.

1. We cannot approve the *hasty, unsparing and almost ferocious denunciation* of a man who happens to come from the South, which we have recently seen in the case of Rev. Mr. White. To drag a man's name into the public prints, and hold him up to universal abhorrence, while neither time nor pains have been taken to ascertain the truth in relation to him, we think altogether unjustifiable. We believe that Rev. Mr. White is not, and never has been, a slaveholder, in any sense of the word, neither is his wife. All that can be said is, that the father of Mrs. White does hold slaves, but we think it visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children too soon altogether, to call Mr. White to account at present for the sins of his father-in-law. When Mr. White has taken these slaves or any into his own hands, it will be time enough to hold him responsible for what he does with them. The attempt to tarnish his character with the sin of slaveholding, when he has never been guilty of it, we believe to be decidedly wrong.

2. *Insinuations*, thrown before the world in print,

because somebody has happened to guess that all was not right, we believe cannot be justified. We allude particularly to the repeatedly published insinuation, that Rev. Mr. Blagden is a slaveholder. We hardly dare trust ourselves to speak of this act of monstrous injustice. If the conductors of the Liberator know that this gentleman is a slaveholder, and have the proofs in their possession, let them boldly assert it. But to *insinuate* such a thing before the public, while they have no proof of it! It is a wicked, it is a base thrust at a man's reputation. We should be ashamed to lift up our heads as abolitionists, if we failed to rebuke this sin. It may perhaps be said, that 'Mr. Blagden can easily deny it, if it be not true, and thus put the matter at once to rest.' He has doubtless enough to do, without going into a newspaper to repel mere insinuations. The minister of the gospel who should attempt, in this day, to wage a newspaper warfare with every insinuation that might chance to be thrown out against his character, would find but little time for more important duties. For a man to attempt the defence of his own character, under any circumstances, is a painful task. And he who deals out insinuations against his neighbor, and then calls upon him to clear himself, 'casts about fire-brands, arrows and death in sport.' Whose reputation is safe in the hands of such a man? He may select the purest being on earth as his victim; 'and suppose--and guess--that he is a thief, or an adulterer,' and throw his guesses before the public. Many will believe them to be substantial facts. Others will think there must be some ground for such accusations, and begin to entertain suspicions of the individual. Oh! if there be an act which our souls loathe, it is the attempt to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood. And insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying. We are grieved to see it resorted to by any one calling himself an abolitionist.

3. We wish to say a word on the subject of *notices*. It has become very common to give notices of various descriptions to ministers of the gospel, in order that they may be publicly read from the pulpit. Every minister in the city receives occasionally some notices which he thinks it improper for him to read. He has a right to be his own judge in such matters. We know of no obligation resting on any minister of the gospel, to make himself a town-crier, or his pulpit a vehicle for public information. Every pastor will of course announce his own appointments to his own people, without asking permission of any one; no man or body of men can, with any propriety, command him to announce their appointments. He has a right, we repeat it, to be his own judge. We believe that clergymen who are abolitionists, claim this right for themselves,

and unhesitatingly use it; nor are we yet convinced that they are not ready to concede it to others. We have been accustomed to read anti-slavery notices in our own pulpits; and shall continue to do so, when we think it advisable, and only then. While we hope to be governed by Christian principles in this, and all other things, we shall pay no regard to the authoritative mandates of men.

We regret exceedingly the apparent tone of *demand*, with which the Liberator has urged the reading of anti-slavery notices. There are other ways by which information can be communicated, which, to say the least, are quite as orderly and decent as those that are frequently resorted to by certain individuals. We do not wish, therefore, to be identified with those who have raised an outcry against some clergymen, because they decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings. We should indeed rejoice, if these brethren felt it to be their duty to do everything in their power to help forward the cause of immediate emancipation. We believe it to be a cause founded in righteousness and truth, and we say, with our whole hearts, God speed it to its full consummation. But we wish to see the cause move onward by the propelling force of truth and argument, and not by a spirit of domineering. We are opposed to the press-gang system of doing things as much as we are to the gag-law. We wish simply to pour light on the understanding, and love into the hearts of men, and in this way to move them to exert their influence in behalf of oppressed humanity. We should be exceedingly unwilling to employ slave-labor in carrying forward the work of emancipation; and hence do not wish to see those who are not yet ready to lend us their aid *scourged and lashed* up to the work. A pouring forth of light, with the meekness of Christ and the patience of hope, will, in our humble opinion, do the work much better and with far greater despatch, than any measures which look like an attempt to coerce.

3. The above remarks apply more particularly to the conduct of ministers, *while exercising their rights in their own pulpits*. But what course ought an abolitionist to pursue, when in the pulpit of his brother clergyman? When it is known to him that that brother whose pulpit he occupies does not read anti-slavery notices himself, nor wish them to be read by others, should he pay no regard to his rights? It may be said, that such a brother pays no regard to our rights. It may be said that, 'he assumes the authority, when in the pulpit of an abolitionist, to throw away anti-slavery notices, although he is aware that it is the minister's wish that they should be read.' True: but this does not touch the question. Is it right for one minister of the gospel to go into another's pulpit, and there take the liberty to do what he knows the presiding pastor disapproves? We say, No. 'But,' it may be objected, 'what if a large portion of the congregation are abolitionists?' It matters not. There is a proper way of dealing with a pastor, with whose course the people are dissatisfied; but so long as he retains his office, it is not for another clergyman to trample upon the rights appertaining to that office. We shall read no notices whatever in a brother's pulpit against his will. In our own desks, we shall consult our own judgment.

4. We love the cause of Foreign and Home Missions; we love the Tract and Bible and Education Societies; and we love them none the less, because our feelings are interested for our brethren

in bondage. These objects of benevolence have our liveliest sympathies, our earnest prayers, and our ready contributions. We wish to see all these things done, and the work of emancipation not left undone. In truth, one of the greatest of all reasons why we wish the immediate abolition of slavery is, that we regard it as one of the most direct and powerful hindrances to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. His kingdom we love; and because we believe that these several associations contribute to its increase and prosperity, we cannot sympathize with those who would withhold their prayers and aid from them, that they may bestow all upon the specific object of emancipation. We wish to see the hearts of Christians sufficiently large to embrace all these objects together. They all aim at one and the same great and glorious result—the universal triumph of Christ. We wish to see the bark of salvation speed onward, and would therefore throw slavery into the sea as a tremendous mass, greatly hindering its progress; but we have no idea of striking sail and lying by, our canvass shivering in the wind, while we accomplish this work; in that case, it must be a late day before we could hope to see the end of the voyage. But because our bark sinks deep, we would call on all, while she is under way, laboring onward through the waves, to lend a hand, that we may lighten her as soon as possible, and increase the rate of her progress towards the long desired haven.

We wish to say, therefore, that for the full, faithful, fearless, and uncompromising declaration of the truth, and the whole truth, on the subject of slavery, we are always ready. We are willing to identify ourselves with the cause of the oppressed, and to do for them as we, in like circumstances, should wish men to do for us. But as to this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c.,—this tone of demand upon others to surrender up their rights—this abandonment of highly important objects—we say unhesitatingly and decidedly, that we wholly disapprove of such measures, and must forever disapprove of them.

5. Our feelings are often exceedingly pained by the *abuse* which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies. It is not long since we were all slumbering together over this subject. Though abolitionists feel confident that they have taken the right ground, and that those who do not stand with them are in the wrong, it certainly does not become them to call men of acknowledged piety and great worth of character, hypocrites, and knaves, because they do not just now see eye to eye with those who have had most to do in the cause of anti-slavery. The time is very fully in our recollection, when we were not abolitionists; nor are we conscious that we were then either hypocrites or knaves. We have no sympathy with those who make such indiscriminate use of these epithets. We condemn their conduct. These things do *injustice* to individuals and are *great hindrances* to our work.

These, and things of like nature, prevent many worthy men from appearing in favor of immediate emancipation. *We know this to be a fact*. Men who have a quick sense of propriety, are not willing to be identified with such movements. Their hearts bleed for the oppressed; but they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf by these unjustifiable measures. They suppose that the great body of abolitionists approve of these things,

because they suffer them in silence. It is more-over to be feared, that unless a different course is pursued, many who, in times past, have labored much in this cause, will withdraw in despair, and weep in secret places.

(Signed)

CHARLES FITCH, Boston.
DAVID SANFORD, Dorchester.
WM. M. CORNELL, Quincy.
JONAS PERKINS, Weymouth.
JOS. H. TOWNE, Boston.

REPLY TO MR. FITCH AND OTHERS.

To the Editor of the Spectator :

Your last paper contains a most extraordinary article, signed by Rev. Charles Fitch, and four other reputed Anti-Slavery ministers, which it becomes our duty, as editor pro tem. of the Liberator, to notice. We shall confine what we have to say chiefly to the matters of fact involved in the case, as we understand a further reply will be made to the article in question by another individual in your next paper.

In the first place, we cannot forbear to express our astonishment that these ministers, who have taken upon themselves the task of correcting the faults of the Liberator, did not send their communication to the columns of that paper. The Liberator has always been open to all its friends or enemies, who wished to contribute to its course. Not one of the signers of it has intimated to us, or to any other individual, that he was dissatisfied with the course of the paper, that he was dissatisfied with the course which has been published in its columns. Was it then either magnanimous or honorable in these *professed* friends of the Anti-Slavery cause to attack the Liberator in the columns of another paper? If men set themselves up as censors of the press, they surely ought not to transgress the laws of common civility, to say nothing of that courtesy which is due to friends laboring in the same cause. Did these gentlemen doubt the readiness of the editor of the Liberator to correct any erroneous statements which he had made? Was it their object to defend Messrs White and Blagden? The defence surely ought to have been made through the same paper which had injured them. Perhaps they were fearful that their manifesto, if sent to the Liberator, might be accompanied with some comments to neutralize the effect which it was intended to have in certain quarters. Be that as it may, their course is unworthy of their character as ministers, and a sad commentary upon their high professions of regard for the reputation of their brethren.

But we proceed to notice the allegations and insinuations contained in their communication.

1. *The case of Mr. White.* What authority had Mr. Fitch and his associates for saying that neither 'time nor pains [had] been taken to ascertain the truth in relation to him?' Did either of them take 'time or pains' to learn the authority on which we

called him a slaveholder? If Mr. Fitch or Mr. Towne had spent but a small fraction of the time employed by them in a journey to Weymouth to get Mr. Perkins' signature to this strange manifesto, in making inquiries at the proper source, they might have learned that our statement, so far from having been 'hastily' made, was not published without extensive and careful inquiry. We were first informed by an *opponent* of the Anti-Slavery cause that Mr. White was an extensive slaveholder, and that he had preached in Park-street and Bowdoin-street churches. We made a memorandum of the statement, with the intention to publish it, if, on inquiry, we should find it to be correct. We then took both 'time and pains' to inquire of at least eight or ten individuals, and from every one we received the assurance that he was a slaveholder. Several of these individuals were men who, we supposed, would be very likely to know the truth in the case. It was not without what we considered the best authority that could be obtained, short of legal evidence, that we made the statement. And what is the authority on which Mr. Fitch and his associates have contradicted our statement? Have they taken 'time and pains' to ascertain the truth? 'We believe,' say they, 'that Rev. Mr. White is not and never has been a slaveholder.' We believe he has been and still is a slaveholder, to all intents and purposes. We have been informed on authority which will be satisfactory to us until Mr. White himself publicly denies the truth of the statement, that ever since his marriage, he has had in his possession one or more slaves. That his father-in-law ever executed deeds of conveyance to him of a slave or slaves, we do not say, but that he has had one or more in his possession, and entirely under his control, and that they have been regarded by himself and his relations as virtually his, we have no doubt. We have conversed within a few days with a worthy clergyman of this State, who is intimately acquainted with Mr. White, and who says that he has always understood him to be a slaveholder. We have also been informed by a highly respectable citizen of Randolph, Mr. White's native town, that the people of that place, both friends and opponents, have always supposed that he was a slaveholder. We understand, also, on what we shall consider satisfactory evidence till Mr. White himself denies it, that the people of his parish have given him a quantity of land which is cultivated by SLAVES, and that he is supported in part by the proceeds of their unrequited toil. The statement that he is a slaveholder, moreover, is not by any means new. We are informed that he has been spoken of as such repeatedly in the newspapers within a few years, and we are not aware that the statement has been contradicted by himself or his friends. Whether his conduct in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church affords evidence that he is a slaveholder, let the following extract

from one of his speeches made at the last meeting of that body show ;

'If the General Assembly have a right to assume the powers asserted in the resolutions now on the table, they may say that my Presbytery shall not hold slaves. Let them do that, sir, and their authority will be disregarded. Yes, sir, let them do it,—and, my word for it, they will find they have PRESBYTERIANS to deal with. No, sir,—my Presbytery will NEVER—no, NEVER GIVE UP THEIR RIGHT TO HOLD SLAVES to this Assembly nor to any other Assembly than the 'General Assembly of the First Born in Heaven.'"

The person who uttered this blasphemous speech is admitted to the Orthodox pulpits in Boston, and the Rev. Mr. Fitch and his associates (professed abolitionists!) would have us consider him an abused man, because he has been represented to be a slaveholder!

But the signers of the 'Appeal' complain of the manner in which Mr. White's name was dragged into the columns of the Liberator. It was, say they, 'almost ferocious.' Those who are acquainted with the writings of Rev. Mr. Fitch will be somewhat surprised at such a charge from such a source. 'No man has been more 'unsparing' in the application of 'hard language' to slaveholders than he.' What were the terms in which we spoke of Mr. White, and which Mr. Fitch and his friends consider 'almost ferocious?' We called him a 'man-stealer,' a 'man-thief,' and 'a robber of God's perishing poor.' Is it necessary for us to show that these terms are legitimately applied to all slaveholders? We are justified in their use by these men themselves in the very document now under review; for they tell us that they regard slavery, 'under all circumstances and at all times,' as an 'iniquitous system of ROBBERY.' If slaveholding is in all cases ROBBERY, it strikes us as a very obvious inference that every slaveholder, whether he be an infidel or a minister, is a robber. Perhaps the signers of the 'Appeal' can show us that the character of an action depends upon the profession or office which the man holds that performs it. Are the doctrines of the 'American Union' getting into vogue among abolitionists?

2. *The case of Mr. Blagden.* How did the signers of the 'Appeal' know that we had no better ground for asking whether he was a slaveholder than a mere 'guess?' And if they did not know, what right had they to make such an 'insinuation?' They tell us that insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying. We will not 'trust ourselves to speak' either of the ferocity or the dignity of the insinuation conveyed in this assertion; but we ask them to apply the sentiment to their own conduct in this case. They 'insinuate' that it was nothing more than somebody's 'guess' that led us to ask whether Mr. B. was a slaveholder. We ask again, How did they know this? How did Messrs. Fitch and Towne know it, when they had taken 'neither time nor

pains' to inquire of us? And how did Messrs. San- ford, Cornell and Perkins know it, living as they do out of the city, and having never had any communication with us on the subject? And if they did not know it, how came they to state it in what they themselves pronounce 'the meanest and vilest form of lying?' We hereby inform them that it was nobody's 'guess' that led us to ask the question referred to. We asked it because many individuals, from various circumstances, fully believed that Mr. B. was a slaveholder. The rumor had been current in various quarters for a period of more than six months. Was it not proper in such circumstances to put the question, and call upon Mr. B. to contradict the rumor, if unfounded? But it was 'an attempt to destroy his reputation by falsehood!' A very gentle charge, truly, and expressed too in very modest and dignified terms! How Mr. Blagden can have any reason to complain of the question as an attack upon his reputation, we are at a loss to discover, since he maintains that slaveholding is reputable and perfectly consistent, in some cases, with Christian character. But, say the signers of the 'Appeal,' a man 'may select the purest being on earth as his victim, and suppose and guess that he is a thief or an adulterer,' &c. Suppose 'the purest being on earth' was known to advocate the doctrine, that in certain circumstances it was right to steal and commit adultery, what then? Would he have a right to complain if people suspected him to be guilty of carrying his own principles into practice? If Mr. Blagden is honest in his belief that slaveholding for 'good motives' is right, and consistent with Christian character, why should he complain of our question? We believe that the circumstances were such as fully to justify our course, and we are not yet satisfied that Mr. B. is not what rumor says he is, a slaveholder. That we have been disposed to do him full justice, the article in the last Liberator under the head 'Rumor Contradicted,' which was written and published before we saw or heard of the 'Appeal,' will conclusively show.

3. *Notices.* The signers of the 'Appeal,' complain of 'the apparent tone of demand,' with which the Liberator has urged the reading of anti-slavery notices. If they had quoted the language of the Liberator, the readers of the Spectator, would have had the means of judging of its propriety or impropriety for themselves. The complaint rests upon nothing but mere assertion. We have no recollection of having demanded the reading of anti-slavery notices, and we think Mr. Fitch and his friends will not be able to point out any part of our language which will bear such a construction. To all that the signers of the 'Appeal' have said of the right of ministers to read notices or to refuse to read them, we fully subscribe. But is their conduct therefore an improper subject of comment? May we not form and express an opinion concern-

ing it? You have a *right* to give or withhold the morsel of bread solicited by a hungry man at your door. But suppose you withhold it under circumstances which make it manifest to every body that you are a hard-hearted man? Will your right to do as you please prohibit your neighbors from forming and expressing an opinion of your conduct? Ministers have indeed the *right* to do as they please; and so have editors. What then is our offence? Why, we have expressed an opinion, honestly entertained, that those ministers who refuse to read notices of meetings when their brethren are to assemble to pray for the slave and devise measures for his emancipation, betray a criminal want of sympathy for those in bonds, and exhibit a spirit which is not only inconsistent with the duties of their station, but unworthy the character of high minded and honorable men. If they were possessed of ordinary magnanimity, and were not actuated by the most bitter hostility to the cause of emancipation, they would never refuse to read such notices. They would say, 'This is an important subject—it ought to be discussed—and although we do not approve of all the measures of our brethren, we will not refuse to do an act of kindness for them which is demanded by the rules of common civility and courtesy.' Where is the abolitionist that would refuse to read a notice of a colonization meeting? If there is such an one, he is unworthy to bear the name; and if he can be pointed out to us, we promise to administer reproof as plainly to him as we have done to any of our opponents. We repeat, that we fully concede to ministers the *right* to act as foolishly and wickedly in relation to this matter as they please; but we wish them to understand that we shall always claim the right to express freely our opinion of their conduct. Mr. Fitch and his associates have a *right*, when they go into the pulpits of pro-slavery ministers, to turn their backs upon the slave—to give up *their own* professed principles and act for the time being upon those of their *opponents—if they please*; but we shall not shrink from expressing our opinion that in so doing they show themselves recreant to the principles of Abolitionism and the claims of suffering humanity, and make it manifest that the ties which bind them to their pro-slavery brethren in the ministry are stronger than those which bind them to the slave. They ought to say, 'If we cannot preach in the pulpits of our brethren without descending to the paltry measure of refusing to read notices of Anti-Slavery meetings, we scorn to enter them.' Such a course would ensure the approbation of high-minded and honorable men every where. Their pro-slavery brethren would respect them for their firm adherence to principle, while they would not fail to despise their subserviency in pursuing the opposite course.

We leave the other parts of this stange manifesto, which will no doubt furnish an occasion of joy to

the opponents of Abolitionism every where, while it cannot fail to grieve every true friend of our righteous cause, to be answered at another time and by another individual, who is better qualified than ourselves to do justice to the subject. We have spoken, as it was our duty to do, in self-defence. We regret that our brethren have placed themselves in such an attitude before the public. They cannot fail to see that they have inflicted a deep wound upon the cause which they profess to love.

EDITOR PRO TEM. OF THE LIBERATOR.

A LAYMAN'S REPLY TO A 'CLERICAL APPEAL.'

For a few weeks past, I have been residing in Connecticut, and shall not probably return to Boston before the 23d of August. On leaving the city, I committed the supervision of the *Liberator* to a friend, in whose judgment, editorial tact, and ability, I placed great confidence. He has discharged his trust in a manner very satisfactory to me. Some paragraphs, however, which he has written, have been the ostensible and immediate cause of eliciting as extraordinary a philippic as the anti-slavery controversy has yet brought forth on either side of the question. It is extraordinary on the score of egotism; extraordinary as to the time and manner of its publication; extraordinary as to the character of its attack; extraordinary as respects the objects of its defence; extraordinary for its inconsistency, extraordinary for its misrepresentation; extraordinary as an apology for those who either vigorously assail or give no countenance to the abolition cause; extraordinary as a 'clerical' bull. It appears in the shape of 'An Appeal of Clerical Abolitionists on Anti-Slavery Measures,' in the *New-England Spectator* of August 2, and is inserted in last week's *Liberator*. Its objurgations are vehement and emphatic, and bestowed particularly upon this paper, that is, upon my own head—though one of my friends has furnished the occasion for the emptying of this vial of 'clerical' displeasure. It complains, first, that the *Liberator* has been guilty of 'hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation' of a southern clergyman; secondly, of publishing 'wicked and base insinuations, the meanest and vilest form of lying,' against a 'clerical' associate in Boston; thirdly, of 'attempting to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood'; and fourthly, of 'authoritatively demanding' the reading of anti-slavery notices from the pulpits. There are two other charges, one of which I presume is intended to be applied to anti-slavery publications generally, viz. 'heaping *abuse* upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully [i. e. not at all] into the efforts of anti-slavery societies;' the other is obviously meant as a thrust at the abolitionists as a body, viz. regarding all other benevolent and

religious enterprises, except that of abolition, as deserving little or no countenance at the present time.

1. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary on the score of egotism.

It is signed by five individuals in all, only two of whom are incidentally known abroad as the advocates of immediate emancipation. Mr. Fitch, since he went to Boston, has somewhat signalized himself in the cause by his 'hard language,' 'unsparing denunciations,' and personal 'insinuations'—so that, in listening to him, it has seemed to me that I have not yet begun to give meat for men, but only milk for new-born babes. Indeed, his opposition to slavery, and to those who are for letting that horrid system alone, has been surprisingly rampant—as I shall have occasion to show. I begin to fear that the tremendous energy which he has manifested will prove to have been merely spasmodic. Mr. Towne, a few weeks before he was settled in Boston, lectured in Essex County as an anti-slavery agent; but since that time he has kept himself almost wholly aloof from our meetings, and from intercourse with abolitionists. I have understood that he was in Boston at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in January last, and during the week when the New-England Convention was in session; but though more than a dozen public meetings were held at those highly interesting periods, he was not present at any of them—at least, I could not learn that he was present, on strict enquiry. Avoidance like this does not evince a very lively interest in behalf of the perishing and the dumb. He has also given some private evidence that he has somewhat departed from his first love, and that he means to rank himself among the 'wise' and 'prudent.' Mr. Sanford of Dorchester, and Mr. Perkins of Weymouth, are very good men, but cautious, moderate, timid. Mr. Cornell's name is new to me, and what he has done to advance the cause of bleeding humanity, I have yet to learn. He may have done much, nevertheless. How many of these individuals do now receive, or have at any time taken the Liberator as subscribers, is better known to the proprietor than to myself; nor is it of the slightest importance, except as they have volunteered to stamp the brand of condemnation upon this paper and its editor. Now, from the earnestness and gravity which they exhibit in their 'Appeal,' a stranger, ignorant of the facts in the case, would necessarily suppose that the Atlantean burden of abolitionism rests mainly upon their shoulders; that they are the very pillars of the Temple of Emancipation; that a vast amount of responsibility is rolled upon their hands; that they are the lawful (not self-elected) censors of anti-slavery publications in general, and the Liberator in particular—so that they justly incur blame, and suffer in their character, whenever a paragraph happens to be faulty in style, or erroneous in state-

ment, or reprehensible in language. Quite a mistake. These gentlemen—'clerical' though they be—are not the giants of their race, though they are of respectable dimensions. They declare that they are 'known in public'—but they are not so tall, and by no means so conspicuous, as they seem to flatter themselves. Their clerical '*ipse dixit*,' their professional praise or censure, is not of national consequence, even though they send it forth upon the wings of the press, with their names duly signed at the bottom. Nor is it of any moment in the eyes of the irrelevant writer of these animadversions. Most certainly, I regret that they have been disturbed in their equanimity by the tone and spirit of the Liberator; but I will venture to assure them that no equitable mind will hold them responsible for that tone or spirit. The responsibility is mine alone. I cheerfully admit their right, and trust they will use it freely, to criticise, rebuke, instruct, denounce me and the paper which I edit, in public or in private, in a 'clerical' or lay capacity, as they shall think proper. In this instance, they have used severe terms of condemnation: of these I do not complain. If they are merited, they ought not to be softened; if unjust, they will do me no permanent injury—though they will doubtless inflict a deep wound upon the abolition enterprise by the eagerness with which they will be circulated by the enemy. How they happen to be precisely those which the worst foes of our cause have uniformly preferred, as reasons for withholding their support from that cause, these 'clerical abolitionists' will do well to consider.

2. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as to the time and mode of its publication.

The time selected is during my absence both from the state and the editorial chair. True, its authors were not obligated to wait until my return: but why in such hot haste to bear their testimony against a single letter of the alphabet of transgressions, of which the Liberator is reputedly guilty? Why not wait, at least, to know whether the 'almost ferocious denunciation' of the 'Rev. Mr. White,' and the 'wicked and base insinuation' against the 'Rev. Mr. Blagden,' would be endorsed or reprobated by the absent editor? But—no! These 'clerical' reprovers were impelled by a zeal which they could not control. They were resolved to strike, but would not stop to hear. To rebuke sinners is their vocation. They belong to a class which has been wont to speak in oracular tones, as it were immediately from heaven, and men have not dared to doubt its inspiration; but the infallibility of the clergy, alas! is beginning to be stoutly denied and profanely ridiculed along with that of his Holiness the Pope. Doubtless there are some latent reasons why this anomalous 'Appeal' has been put forth at the present time. What 'private griefs' its authors have to indulge, I know not. The attack is truly portentous—it is indeed express-

ly significant, if not to the understanding of others, at least to my own—it comes in a ‘clerical’ shape! Nor is the *mode* of publication less worthy of notice. Why was this ‘Appeal’ sent to the *New England Spectator*, rather than to the *Liberator*? Was such a course manly or ingenuous? The preference was unreasonable: it seems to me an impeachment of my willingness to give it publicity—an impeachment far more offensive to me than the ‘Appeal’ itself. What did the readers of the *Spectator* know of the alleged baseness and falsehood of the *Liberator*, in the cases referred to by these five ‘clerical abolitionists? They could not have read the abnoxious articles, as they were not copied into the *Spectator*. The injury (if any) was done in the columns of this paper: why, then, did not these generous volunteers in behalf of the enemies of their own most righteous cause, seek redress through the same medium? When have I refused to let friend or foe castigate me, to his heart’s content, in the *Liberator*?

3. This ‘Appeal’ is extraordinary as to the character of its attack,

It comes from professed abolitionists—from those who think their abolition orthodoxy cannot be doubted. Omitting a very few words in it, it is precisely such a homily, in its extenuation, its perverseness, its sophistry, its denunciation, as Joseph Tracy and brother, Asa Cummings, Leonard Bacon and Wilber Fisk, (the number five is complete,) could and will unquestionably adopt with shouts of exultation. It is pregnant with the same dolorous cant which has so long characterised the *Boston Recorder*, *Christian Mirror*, *Vermont Chronicle*, &c. &c. about ‘base thrusts at a man’s reputation;’ about ‘hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation;’ about ‘wicked and base insinuations;’ about ‘casting around fire-brands, arrows and death;’ about ‘the right of every minister to be his own judge’ as to his duty to read anti-slavery notices; about ‘their ignorance of ‘any obligation resting on any minister of the gospel to make himself a town-crier, or his pulpit a vehicle for public information;’ about ‘a spirit of domineering;’ about ‘the press-gang system of doing things;’ about ‘an unwillingness to employ slave-labor in carrying forward the work of emancipation;’ about ‘scourging and lashing men up to the work;’ about ‘attempts to coerce;’ about the folly of ‘striking sail, and lying by, our canvass shivering in the wind, while we accomplish this work;’ about ‘this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c.—this tone of demand upon others to surrender up their rights—this abandonment of highly important objects;’ about ‘wholly disapproving such measures, now and forever;’ about the *abuse* which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies;’ about ‘calling men of acknowledged piety and great worth of

character hypocrites* and knaves, because they do not just now see eye to eye with those who have had most to do in the anti-slavery cause;’ about ‘beating off those, whose hearts bleed for the oppressed, from active exertion in their behalf by these unjustifiable measures;’ about ‘the propelling force of truth and argument;’ about ‘pouring light on the understanding, and love into the hearts of men, and in this way to move them to exert their influence in behalf of oppressed humanity,’ &c. &c. &c. All these are merely the stale repetitions of what has been falsely iterated a thousand times over by pro-slavery advocates and mawkish apologists of slaveholders ever since my voice was first lifted up in the cause of my enslaved countrymen. They have not even the poor merit of originality—being most palpable plagiarisms from the columns of all the colonization presses in the land. Every discriminating, ‘dyed-in-the wool’ abolitionist will perceive, at a glance, that they are an embodiment of the most common, most flippant, most plausible objections to the anti-slavery cause, its advocates and measures, which have been urged by the rulers in church and state for the last five years. Indeed, so thickly interspersed are these charges and ‘insinuations’ throughout this sacerdotal ‘Appeal,’ by the hands of these professed fellow-laborers, they at first appear like ingenious strokes of satire, intended for the backs of Messrs. Fisk, Stuart, Bacon, Tracy and Cummings, though seemingly applied with mock gravity to ‘some leading abolitionists.’ But they are not used sportively—they are seriously uttered, so that all the aspersions and ‘pleas of the pro-slavery fraternity just alluded to are fully endorsed by ‘several individuals,’ i. e. five ‘clerical abolitionists,’ ‘who are known,’ or think they are known, ‘in public and in private, as friends of the anti-slavery cause’!!—There is also a remarkable similarity in the hypothetical and guarded form of reasoning resorted to by these ten censors. The old form used to run thus:—‘I am as much opposed to slavery as you are . . . BUT —.’ In the ‘Appeal,’ it is as follows:—‘We regard slavery as a loud, crying, and exceedingly aggravated sin . . . BUT—we are not a little grieved at some things, which we see in the movements of some leading abolitionists.’ Again: ‘We believe it to be a cause founded in righteousness and truth . . . BUT—we have no idea of striking sail.’ Again: ‘We are willing [what condescension!] to identify ourselves with the cause of the oppressed . . . BUT—as to this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c.’ Finally: ‘Men who have a quick sense of propriety, (!) are not willing to be identified with

* Jesus Christ did so, and thereby gave great offence to the chief priests and rulers:—‘We unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith . . . Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?’

such movements. Their hearts bleed for the oppressed, (?) . . . BUT—they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf, [i. e. deterred from performing the part of the good Samaritan, and compelled to act the part of the Priest and Levite!] by those unjustifiable measures.' Is it possible that this is the dialect of genuine abolitionists? Why, even such papers as the Boston Recorder and Vermont Chronicle have measurably discarded it, and are almost ashamed to use it! Who, for one moment, can doubt that it will fall like a strain of music upon the ears of 'gentlemen of property and standing,' of the advocates of lynch law, of southern taskmasters and their apologists, of a time-serving priesthood, of all that is corrupt, oppressive and worthless in the land? What is it,—at least, what will the vile construe it to mean, but a new justification of mobocratic violence? How can our modern 'scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites,' regard it but as an all-sufficient excuse for standing aloof from the anti-slavery cause, eulogized as 'men who have a quick sense of propriety'? *Et tu, Brute!*

4. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as respects the objects of its defence.

Its tenderness and charity toward Messrs. White and Blagden, are wholly misplaced. The accused have made no public complaint of ill-treatment—nor, in view of the sentiments which they hold on the subject of slavery, do I see how they can complain, either in public or private. They have apparently regarded the 'denunciations' and 'insinuations' of the Liberator, either as too frivolous to require any refutation, or too harmless to do them any injury. If they are not disposed to stand up in self-defence, why should five 'clerical abolitionists' be so filled with rampant zeal in their favor? What right have these five to assume, that these two men feel that their characters have been wantonly assailed, when they preserve unbroken silence?—or to predicate upon this assumption, that the editor of the Liberator has been guilty of wilful defamation? This jealousy for the reputation of Messrs. White and Blagden is highly ludicrous, and absurdly; magnanimous. To say positively that Mr. White is a slaveholder, and 'to insinuate' such a thing, before the public, respecting Mr. Blagden, 'while there is no proof of it, is a wicked, it is a base thrust at a man's reputation,—the meanest and vilest form of lying.' Nay, 'we hardly dare trust ourselves to speak of this act of monstrous injustice!'—I should laugh at this excessive perturbation, if I could make myself merry with those who are in pain, whether it be self-inflicted or otherwise. The crime alleged is, that a southern clergyman, who lately preached in Park-street pulpit, has been charged in the Liberator with being a slaveholder—and that the clergyman who officiates in the Old South Church has by 'insinuation' been

accused of the same thing. Now, is this to 'hold them up to universal abhorrence?' By no means. None but 'fanatical abolitionists' believe that slaveholding is a crime in all cases and under all circumstances whatsoever. Mr. Blagden holds and maintains that, in itself considered, it is a relation sanctioned by God, supported by revelation, consistent with Christian character, and in many cases signal-ly philanthropic and praiseworthy. As Mr. White is from the South,—his father-in-law being a slaveholder,—I have no reason to suspect that his views differ from Mr. B's. respecting the act of slaveholding. Is it, then, 'an act of monstrous injustice,' 'a base thrust' at the reputation of Mr. Blagden, to 'insinuate' that he practices what he preaches? that he sustains a relation which he says is right and laudable? that he is doing the very thing which the Bible approves? How absurd! Professor Stuart has publicly declared, that slaveholding and Christianity are in perfect agreement. 'The relation of master and slave is not,' he says, 'as a matter of course, abrogated between all Christians. The abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong. . . Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon, with apology for running away, to be his servant [or, according to the Professor's translation, his SLAVE] for life (!!) *Paul's conduct and advice are still safe guides.* . . The relation of master and slave may exist, without violating the Christian faith (!!)—Now, if I should publicly interrogate Prof. S., whether he is a slaveholder, and 'insinuate' that he, is even upon hearsay evidence, and without taking any pains to ascertain the facts in the case, would he or his friends—above all, would abolitionists be justified in raising a hue-and-cry against me, that I am 'attempting to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood,' by 'the meanest and vilest form of lying!' and 'casting about fire-brands, arrows and death in sport?' Ridiculous! Yet, this is 'the head and front of our offending' in the present case. Let every tub stand on its own bottom. If a man declares that murder is no crime, and 'quotes scripture for the deed,' I do him no wrong by 'insinuating' that he may have committed or is prepared to commit murder. True, if I should 'insinuate' that Charles Fitch holds a human being in slavery,—knowing as I do that he regards every slaveholder as a man-stealer,—I should basely traduce his character, but *only among abolitionists*; but knowing that George W. Blagden maintains that slaveholding is not a *malum in se*, surely I may honestly inquire of him, 'Thou that sayest, a man may be a slaveholder in accordance with the will of God, art thou a slaveholder?' Nor will he be offended by the inquiry, unless he is tormented by his conscience, and is convinced that his is a doctrine of devils. May not Edward C. Delavan plainly ask a man, a clergyman if you please, who ridicules and assails the cause of Temperance, and who declares that the Bible approves of the manufacture, sale

and consumption of ardent spirits, whether he is not a distiller, rum-seller, or moderate drinker? And should he put the question, would it be 'an act of monstrous injustice,' 'a base thrust at a man's reputation,' that should excite the indignation and call forth the rebuke of at least five 'clerical' tee-totalers? Or should an individual cherish the belief that idolatry is not in itself sinful, but in many cases is very commendable,—if he were asked whether he keeps any images, would it be such an outrage upon propriety as imperiously to require a clerical disclaimer? It is needless to multiply illustrations. But, in the opinion of the authors of the 'Appeal,' nothing is more deserving of reprobation than to measure a man by his own standard of rectitude, or to 'insinuate' that he allows in himself what he avers any Christian may do with impunity, nay, with divine approbation! It is now indisputable, that the enemies of our cause can adduce one specimen of 'abolition fanaticism.' But abolitionists will not hold themselves responsible for such a piece of 'clerical' folly.

These gentlemen kindly account for Mr. Blagden's silence—as follows:—'It may perhaps be said, that 'Mr. Blagden can easily deny it, if it be not true, and thus put the matter at once to rest.' *He has doubtless enough to do, without going into a newspaper to repel mere insinuations.*' How does it happen that these gentlemen find so much more leisure than himself, and are so deeply agitated when he is so tranquil, and are so ready to 'go into a newspaper' and regard 'mere insinuations,' as worthy their united abhorrence, and also of public condemnation? Again, they say—'The minister of the gospel, who should attempt, in this day, to wage a newspaper warfare with every insinuation that might chance to be thrown out against his character, would find but little time for more important duties.' With what show of consistency, then, do they turn aside from their 'more important duties,' to meddle with that which, according to their own showing, is beneath notice? Have they yet to learn by experience, that 'the better part of valor is discretion?'

Of Mr. White they say—'The attempt to *tarnish his character* with the *SIN OF SLAVEHOLDING*, when he has never been guilty of it, we believe to be decidedly wrong.' What will Mr. White's slaveholding church-members and parishioners say of such a vindication by such men? Will it gladden their hearts, or elevate him in their estimation? Is Mr. White himself pleased with this defence? Does he like the charitable 'insinuation' on the part of his abolition witnesses, that if he were a slaveholder, he would be too vile a character to be received into christian fellowship—no better, in fact, than a murderer or man-stealer? Verily, in this particular, he may properly quote the Spanish proverb:—'Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies!' *He does not believe that slaveholding*

is a sin, in all cases. Undoubtedly, in his opinion, 'clerical' slave-masters are the best of all.

5. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary for its inconsistency.

This charge has already been sufficiently proved. What can be more inconsistent than for abolitionists to take the weapons of their enemies, in order to inflict mortal wounds upon each other? What greater inconsistency, than in one breath to make flaming professions of attachment to the anti-slavery cause—and in the next, to retail and endorse all the stereotyped slanders of the enemies of that cause? Is it consistent for professedly humane men to justify the obdurate conduct of the Priest and Levite? Can the genuine friends of the down-trodden slave consistently excuse the behavior of those clergymen who condemn all anti-slavery meetings, and persist in suppressing all notices of such meetings? NO!

6. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary for its misrepresentation.

Its authors affect to abominate 'insinuations,' and brand them as 'the meanest and vilest form of lying.' They 'are grieved to see it resorted to by any one calling himself an abolitionist.' Excellent instructors! Their 'Appeal' is crowded with 'insinuations,' alike false and uncharitable. The beam is in their own eye, while they are beholding with ruffled tempers the mote that is in their brother's eye. They first insinuate that 'the conductor of the Liberator' was actuated by wicked and base motives in his allusions to Messrs. White and Blagden. How liberal! They next insinuate that he rashly 'casts about fire-brands, arrows and death in sport.' This, also, is charitable.

But, 'a word on the subject of *notices*.' We are told that 'every minister in the city receives occasionally some notices which he thinks it improper for him to read.' Doubtless. 'He has a right to be his own judge in such matters.' Who denies it? But not the sole judge. The people have a right, every man has it, to examine and comment upon his decisions. The clerical garb shall not hide his deformity, nor the clerical station screen his guilt. 'We know of no obligation resting on any minister of the gospel to make himself a *town-crier*.' I know of none. But what a sentiment to fall from the lips of abolitionists, in vindication of ministers who will not read a notice of an anti-slavery meeting! How reasonable it appears, that to request such a notice to be read from the pulpit, is in fact to ask a minister to turn 'TOWN-CRIER!!' If this be abolitionism, then all is gold that glistens. One would think this ought to suffice, by way of clerical justification: but another objection 'to the reading of anti-slavery notices' is generally put into the mouths of clergymen, by those who claim to be 'abolitionists in the strictest sense.' It is in the following words:—'There are other ways by which information may be communicated, which, to say

the least, are quite as ORDERLY and DECENT as those that are frequently resorted to by certain individuals.' [Here is an insinuation against sundry persons—and these gentlemen declare that 'insinuation' is the meanest and vilest form of lying!]

Again: 'No man or body of men can, with any propriety, command a pastor to announce their appointments.' This is nothing but a man of straw: an earnest request, an importunate entreaty, is not a command. 'We regret exceedingly the apparent tone of demand, with which the Liberator has urged the reading of anti-slavery notices.' This tone of demand has been nothing more than the enforcement of the apostolic injunction, 'Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them.'

Again: 'We have been accustomed to read anti-slavery notices [what! to act as town-criers!] in our own pulpits; and shall continue to do so, when we think it advisable, AND ONLY THEN. . . We shall pay no regard to the authoritative mandates of men.' This wears a fearless and independent aspect—but its authors are not the bravest men in the world, though they use 'great swelling words.' Nor is it any impeachment of their veracity to say, that they may be mistaken in their estimate of their own courage and determination. No, gentlemen, for one I cannot believe that you will read anti-slavery notices when YOU 'think it advisable, and only then.' You will do just as your church and congregation shall desire. Their mandates will be 'authoritative,' and you will pay some regard to them. If not—you know what will be the consequence. The clergy, with some rare and noble exceptions, (in the language of the Richmond Whig, as applied to the people of the North,) 'know too well on which side their bread is buttered,' to come in collision with the feelings and wishes of those who feed and clothe them. I do not mean to 'insinuate,' that you will trim your sails to catch the popular gale, at the sacrifice of principle; but your situation is a perilous one, and a pastor who is completely independent of his flock is a spiritual phenomenon. It becomes you, however, not to boast how sturdy and inflexible you are resolved to be, and how perfectly regardless of the opinions of those who contribute to your salary. Have you yet found occasion to try what stun you are made of—the quality of your clerical mettle—your capableness of endurance? In how many instances have you taken the lead of your people to carry forward an unpopular reform? How many times, and to what extent, have you dared to be singular, erect, immovable? The gentleman whose name is first appended to your 'Appeal,' Mr. Fitch,—as I stated at the commencement of these strictures,—has displayed a rampant zeal, and spoken in a bold tone, in favor of immediate emancipation, since he was installed in Boston; but I am told that he was dumb on this subject during his residence in Hartford, and did not begin to flame until he was called

to settle over the Free Church in Boston—i. e. a red hot abolition church. But I shall examine this gentleman's consistency under another head.

Again: 'We do not wish to be identified with those who have raised an outcry against some clergymen, because they decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings.' So be it, gentlemen! you shall be excepted. This 'outcry' has been raised by abolitionists, singly and as a body, all over the free States, wherever they have experienced such treatment at the hands of those whose duty it is, to 'cry aloud, spare not, lift up their voice like a trumpet,' and 'open their mouths in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction.' Hence it follows, that the authors of the 'Appeal' do not wish to be identified with the great body of abolitionists—certainly not in this particular. Let them, therefore, take their place, in this particular, in the ranks of our opponents.

Now, a word in regard to other benevolent enterprises. All that is 'insinuated' in the 'Appeal' under this head, does flagrant injustice to the feelings and sentiments of abolitionists. There is a parade of impartial benevolence and liberal regard for all good objects, on the part of these admonishers, which is alike ridiculous and vain. They are not contracted in their views, or limited in their charities, or exclusive in their prayers—O, no! they forget nothing, love every thing, and would do good on a scale at once grand and magnanimous! Surely, this is noble—and it would be still more commendable, if it were less boastful in its tone, and not slanderous in its imputation. Behold the liberality of five 'clerical abolitionists,' as modestly set forth over their own signatures:

'We love the cause of Foreign and Home Missions; we love the Tract and Bible and Education Societies; and we love them none the less, because our feelings are interested for our brethren in bondage.'

Nor does the great body of abolitionists love them any the less. Does it follow that because such men as Arthur Tappan and Gerrit Smith deem it to be their duty, under present circumstances, to give their means and influence almost exclusively to the cause of the enslaved in our land, therefore they are either indifferent or hostile to other holy enterprises? Monstrous conclusion!

'These objects of benevolence have our liveliest sympathies, our earnest prayers, and our ready contributions.'

Undoubtedly.

'We wish to see all these things done, and the work of emancipation not left undone. . . We wish to see the hearts of Christians sufficiently large to embrace all these objects together.'

Mark! The 'insinuation' is, that abolitionists, as such, do not wish to see any such thing!

'We cannot sympathize with those who would withhold their prayers and aid from them, that they may bestow all upon the specific object of emancipation.'

Who are the men against whom this charge is

made? Where is the evidence to sustain it? It appears in a naked form, wholly unsupported by a little of proof, and therefore can challenge no evidence. It has been often proffered against abolitionists by their 'clerical' foes, but never before by their 'clerical' friends. The case is not fairly stated, because its language is calculated to give a wrong impression. It is certainly true, that abolitionists regard the cause which they espouse, as requiring a special (not an exclusive) consecration of their time, means and energies for its promotion, inasmuch as it is struggling against wind and tide, against the combined powers of Church and State, and as the religious enterprises above alluded to are borne upon a golden tide of prosperity, encountering no other obstacles than those which selfishness or apathy throws in their way. But we do not love other good objects less, because we love the abolition cause more; and we are convinced that upon the success of our cause is depending not merely the welfare of Tract and Bible and Education Societies, &c., but the very existence of our Republic. When those, whose interest and money are wholly absorbed in these Societies, will give an equal and impartial support to the American Anti-Slavery Society, we shall then cease to be invidiously devoted to the interests of that association. Nay, when they shall abate their present fierce opposition to our cause, even if they shall give it no public countenance, we shall then be enabled to do more for their favorite schemes than it is in our power to do at the present fearful crisis. We are constrained to regard it as base and cruel, in our enemies, to reproach us, in our feebleness and low estate, because we are so zealously engaged in undoing the heavy burdens of our enslaved countrymen, and because we cast into the treasury of bleeding humanity our two mites, which is nearly all that we possess. But we have no language to describe our feelings, when this reproach is taken up by *professed friends*, and endorsed as being merited, and even extended so far as to hold us up in the light of hostility to enterprises of kindred excellence! 'This is the unkindest cut of all.' The truth is, that while abolitionists are from necessity specially consecrated to their own appropriate work,—and that too only *pro tempore*, until 'the hearts of Christians are sufficiently large' to embrace it cordially,—they are, as a body, remarkably active in every 'good word and work.' They are doing wonders for the cause of Peace; they are the most uncompromising friends of the cause of Temperance; they cherish the unpopular cause of Moral Reform; they contribute to the funds of the Bible, Tract, and Education Societies, and to the cause of Foreign and Home Missions; and they take a more than ordinary interest in every object which is calculated to advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Indeed, if they are blameworthy at all, it is because they scatter their means

too widely, instead of concentrating them more directly upon the cause of Emancipation. The God of love will not chide them if, for a little while, they should measurably withdraw their support from an enterprise which is strong and popular, and extend it to one which is feeble and odious, and which is, in fact, a Missionary, Tract, Education, and Bible Society, in itself, blending all human interests in one, and constituting in a comprehensive view the sum total of all human efforts. Let them give more freely, *more exclusively*, to this mighty enterprise, than they have hitherto done; for the wealth, and aristocracy, and religion of the land is against it, and it needs their liberal aid, and must have it in greater proportion than ever, or ALL IS LOST. That they have not bestowed *all* their money 'upon the specific object of emancipation,' at least five 'clerical abolitionists' know very well—for they have had their share of it, perhaps more than they deserve, perhaps more than some of them will again receive. They can hardly expect, if they are reasonable men, that the abolitionists will put money into their pockets, to be slandered and reproached before all the people in return, as a *quid pro quo*.

Once more:

'We wish to see the bark of salvation speed onward, and would therefore throw slavery into the sea as a tremendous mass, greatly hindering its progress; but we have no idea of striking sail and lying by, our canvass shivering in the wind, while we accomplish this work.'

This simile is not perfectly accurate. Slavery is not a mere mass of inert matter, ponderous indeed, but that cannot widen and grow. It is a fatal leak that is gaining momentum upon our bark, and with fearful rapidity, and which threatens to overwhelm it in the 'vasty deep.' The face of the heavens is apparently serene, the gale seems prosperous, our bark has every sail set, a large portion of the passengers and crew are slumbering profoundly, some of those who are awake are laughing at the cry of danger, others deny that a leak has been sprung, while others give up all hopes of preservation, and resolve to meet their fate with philosophical composure. Some are willing to take the helm, (as a post of honor,) or to go aloft, (loving to be elevated,) but only a few of the hands are standing by the pumps, and working as it were with superhuman energy, for the salvation of all on board. In spite of their unremitting exertions, the water in the hold continues to increase. At this awful crisis, five of their number join with the infatuated majority in reprobating such an exclusive attention to 'the specific object,' of pumping the ship! and because some of the 'clerical' passengers have been hit by the handle, (not being willing either to take hold themselves, or to get out of the way,) these five actually threaten, that, 'unless a different course is pursued,' they will 'withdraw in despair,' and make no further efforts to save the ship! Pump away, ye forsaken, calumniated, toil-worn little band, and may the

Lord Almighty strengthen you mightily in the inner and the outer man! By your allegiance to heaven, 'DON'T GIVE UP THE SHIP!'

7. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as an apology for those who either vigorously assail, or give no countenance to the anti-slavery cause.

It declares that no censure ought to be passed upon any minister who shall refuse, uniformly and inflexibly, to read notices of anti-slavery meetings. If such refusal were not, *as it is*, a test of character, a declaration of unyielding hostility to the abolition cause,—if it originated in a mere difference of opinion as to the most suitable method of giving information to the people,—then indeed it might be offered to pass without special condemnation. But the fact is otherwise. Those ministers who refuse to read our notices are not deterred from so doing by the paltry reasons stated in the 'Appeal,' namely, lest they shall be regarded as turning *town-criers*, (a merry conceit!) or because there are other ways, 'more orderly and decent,' by which information may be communicated—no indeed! They hate our doctrines—they quarrel with our measures—they deny the right of the slaves to be immediately emancipated—they justify slavery from the Bible—they espouse the side of the oppressor—they fellowship men-stealers as christian brethren—they brand us as disturbers of the public peace, and with every odious and contemptuous term—they approve of a crusade against all skins 'not colored like their own,' to get them out of the country—and they expressly assert the invincibility of prejudice, and advocate the propriety of caste! Wherever a minister is found obstinately refusing to notify his people of an anti-slavery meeting, in him you will find embodied the whole herd of colonization and pro-slavery abominations. He is among the worst enemies of the colored race, and the best friends of slaveholders. Whenever, therefore, abolitionists censure him for suppressing their notices, they do so in view of his known pro-slavery feelings and actions—and *the people so understand it*. Yet the magnanimous 'five' would fain leave the impression, that an 'outcry' is raised 'against some clergymen,' solely because 'they decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings!' Is this honest? is it just? is it true? They know that all those clergymen are the greatest stumbling-blocks in the way of emancipation, and that they are laboring with all their might, to make our cause, and its advocates, vile in the eyes of the people: yet they step forward as a body guard to shield them from attack, and to drive back their assailants!—They go on to say:

'Our feelings are often exceedingly pained by the *abuse* which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies.'

'Abuse'? The allegation is false. The silken

phraseology, 'do not feel prepared to enter,' is intended to hide a multitude of omitties to abolitionism. Those who make this plea are well known: on the subject of human rights they must be born again, before they can ever 'feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies.' Let us see whether they do not deserve the severest reprehension, either for attempting to observe neutrality, or for giving countenance to the merciless opposition which is waging against our cause.

The 'Appeal' is written in the style and taste of Charles Fitch, and I presume he is not ashamed of its authorship. Let us look at his consistency. He says that he 'regards slavery as a loud crying, and exceedingly aggravated sin, under all circumstances, and at all times'—as an 'iniquitous system of robbery and wrong, worthy only of universal and eternal abhorrence.' In an anti-slavery address by this gentleman, recently printed in Boston, entitled 'Slaveholding weighed in the Balance of Truth,' he undertakes to show how evil and bitter a thing slavery is, compared with other sins of mammoth magnitude. Hear him:

'That slavery is greater, in some of its bearings at least, than any other evil that ever existed among men, and *involves more guilt than any other crime ever committed by men*, I fully believe, and shall endeavor to show; still, the evil has a magnitude which my powers cannot describe, and the guilt a blackness which can never be painted, EXCEPT BY A PENCIL DIPPED IN THE MID-NIGHT OF THE BOTTOMLESS PIT.'

He then proceeds to compare Slavery with Popery, and after forcibly describing the abominations of the latter, he remarks—

'I say, then, there are points in which Slavery far outdoes the *Romish Church in cruelty and guilt*; binds heavier burdens, and more grievous to be borne, and lays them on men's shoulders, and will not touch them with a finger.'

He next looks at Infidelity, and sums up the result thus:

'My claim is, that slavery destroys more souls among the slaves by keeping the Bible away from them, *than Infidelity could do in its place*, if they were permitted to have the Bible and read for themselves; and it seems to me that this is a position which no honest man will dispute. Slavery also destroys souls by force, when infidelity could only decoy, and therefore leave an opportunity for escape.'

He next compares slavery with the making and vending of ardent spirits, and after saying that 'all, and far more than all which has ever been said or dreamed of the guilt of that abominable business is strictly true,' he asks—

'Is it not most clearly a truth, then, that slavery destroys more souls, than the making and vending of ardent spirit?'—'Who will not say that slavery is unspeakably more to be dreaded [than intemperance,] and that it is an evil of far greater magnitude than the other?'

He next compares slavery with theft and robbery, and having described a case in which he thinks

theft and robbery 'stand out in their worst features,' he asks—

'Where is the man under heaven, who would not say, that such a system of legalized oppression, was infinitely worse than theft or robbery, when practised toward himself?'—It is to have a miserable existence, subjected to the most cruel, heart-withering tyranny, that was ever practised by man on his fellow-man, since this world has borne the curse of its God.—'Theft and robbery are NOTHING, compared with the wickedness of slavery. Make them as bad as you please, and they do not deserve to be named the same week. The difference between them is too great to be described, too wide to be measured, TOO DEEP TO BE FATHOMED. The slaveholder who goes impenitent to hell, will find himself loaded down with a weight of guilt and damnation, that will sink him out of sight of the worst highway robber that ever walked the earth. But you will say, the highway robber is often guilty of murder. Well, and so is the slaveholder often guilty of murder.'

Mr. Fitch next compares slavery with murder, and asks—

'What honest man is not prepared to say, that slavery is worse than murder?'

He next compares slavery 'with fornication and adultery, and the violation of female purity by force,' and after giving some terrible facts respecting the lewdness of the system, breaks forth in the following energetic strain:

'O, when I reflect on this subject, I could almost pray for a voice like a volcano, and for words that would scorch and burn like melted lava, that I might thunder the guilt of the slaveholder in his ears, and talk to him in language which he would feel: Who will say, that this system of slavery, under which no female, who has a drop of African blood in her veins, has any defence for her virtue against any white man, even for an hour, and no possibility of escaping from pollution, is not unspeakably worse than fornication and adultery, or even the violation of purity by force, where there are laws to apprehend and punish for such a crime?'

He next compares slavery with treason, and having related the case of Benedict Arnold, adds—

'I say again, therefore, that the system of slavery is unspeakably worse than treason. But I cannot pursue this parallel further. I have glanced at what men regard as the worst of evils and crimes; but when weighing the guilt of slavery, we find that every thing which we can place in the opposite scale, at once kicks the beam. It has a weight of guilt attached to it, that can be balanced by the guilt of no other crime.'

Behold what slavery is, and what slaveholders are! Has ever a more terrific picture been painted by the most 'fanatical' abolitionist? What 'unsparing denunciations what damning insinuations? what mortal 'thrusts at men's reputation!' Slavery is the blackest of all crimes, as black as 'the midnight of the bottomless pit'—worse than Popery—worse than infidelity—worse than intemperance, or the making and vending of ardent spirits—worse than theft or highway robbery—worse than murder—worse than fornication, adultery, and the violation of female purity by force—worse than treason—worse than any other

crime. Such is the unequivocal testimony of Mr. Fitch, the author and signer of the 'Appeal.' All the slaveholding Doctors of Divinity, Theological Professors, ministers and church members in the United States, are in his opinion, MENSTEALERS, and unless they repent, will find themselves 'loaded down with a weight of guilt and damnation, that will sink them out of sight of the worst men who robbers that ever walked the earth!' And yet—marvellous consistency!—he thinks it is very unkind to denounce those northern clergymen who refuse to assail that horrid system, and expose those unnatural monsters! What if they do refuse to read notices of anti-slavery meetings, and to support our cause—have they not a right to? Are they guilty men because they regard a system, which is worse than Popery, infidelity, and highway robbery, as of divine origin? Are they to be 'scourged and lashed up to the work?' Is it not enough that the Liberator is a very 'abusive' publication, and its editor 'not a member of any church,' to justify them 'from appearing in favor of immediate emancipation?' 'Though 'their hearts bleed for the oppressed,' yet 'they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf' by my 'unjustifiable measures!' If I were not in their way, they would obey God by pleading the cause of his perishing poor, but they are dumb, and must be dumb, so long as the Liberator and its editor are in existence! For their sins of omission and commission, I am justly responsible. They may innocently refuse to interfere for the rescue of their manacled countrymen from a beastly thralldom, because my course has been unjustifiable! Fine reasons for standing aloof from duty, and for turning a deaf ear to the cries of the oppressed, and for taking sides with the oppressor!—reasons that may avail these proud pharisees in the present day for a little season, but will they avail aught at the bar of God? Mr. Fitch himself has pronounced the severest condemnation upon them in his pamphlet, though he tries to exonerate them from blame in his 'Appeal'—having the power to blow hot and cold with the same breath. Thus:

'Tell me not that I have no right to interfere, when I see more than two millions of my neighbors, yea, of my brethren, my own fellow-countrymen, groaning and toiling and dying under the unparalleled wrongs of slavery. I have no right not to interfere. I am a traitor to my neighbor, and a REBEL AGAINST MY GOD, if I forbear to interfere; [Pray is not every other minister or layman?]—if I fail to use the last power which my Maker has given me, in pleading for the immediate deliverance of my fellow-men from their sufferings and their chains.' [So! all northern clergymen, who do not plead for immediate emancipation, are 'rebels against God!'] 'I may not fail to do it lest the fire of God's fury kindle upon me, for my disregard of his high command. And the same is true of all my readers. . . Do you ask, what shall be done? I answer, let every PULPIT thunder forth this mandate of the most high God—let every MINISTER at the altar

cry aloud and spare not, and lift up his voice like a trumpet, and show this people their transgressions, this guilty people their sins.'

And yet, in his 'Appeal,' Mr. Fitch says that there is 'no obligation resting on any minister of the gospel' to read an anti-slavery notice, or, in other words, to make himself a *town-crier*, or his pulpit a vehicle for anti-slavery information!

Strange inconsistency! Hear what he says in another breath—I copy from his pamphlet. Having depicted the awful nature of slavery, he then observes—

'There is one thing more which I wish to name, as giving blackness and aggravation to its guilt. It is, that multitudes of the professed disciples of Christ came forward to justify the system of slavery, and to claim for it the sanctions of the word of God. Yes, this system of slavery, red as it is with crime, black as it is with guilt, and foul as it is with impurity, is called, even by professed Christians and MINISTERS, an institution of the Bible. Oh, it seems to me, that if the long-suffering patience of a forbearing God was ever insulted beyond endurance, it must be when the protection of his authority is claimed for the perpetuity of such a system as this. There is no crime which it does not legalize—no sin which it does not protect—no depth of impurity which it does not dig, and in which it does not permit vile men to wallow. And yet [now for 'insinuations'!] there are not wanting men, *Christian men*, and MINISTERS who wait at the altar of God, who call this an institution of Heaven, and claim for it the authority of the Most High.'

Again he says:

'I am aware that great complaint has often been made of those who have endeavored to rouse the indignation of their fellow-men against the wrongs inflicted on the poor slave, that they deal in unjust severity of language. *That they have at any time spoken more than the truth, I do not believe.*

In his 'Appeal,' he informs us that his 'feelings are often exceedingly pained by the abuse which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel,' &c. But to quote further from his pamphlet:

'When I remember, too, the long and profound slumberings, even of Christians, on this subject, I cannot suppress the feeling, that it was necessary that those who would arouse them, should break forth as in thunder tones, and gird up all their energies, to shake off the sloth in which their fellow-men were bound. . . . It was seen that the press was bribed, and THE PULPIT GAGGED, [what a sweeping 'insinuation'!] and the lips of the multitude padlocked, &c. &c.; and when a few awoke, and saw the nation thus hastening to the precipice of ruin, to be dashed in the abyss below—what less could they do than to cry STOP!—and that too, even at a pitch of remonstrance, which should subject them to the imputation of fanaticism or madness.'

The tune is now changed. Mr. Fitch having blown a Vesuvius blast in his pamphlet, now blows a hyperborean gust in his 'Appeal'! In the former, he is a lion rampant—in the latter, pacific as a lamb. Read this whole remarkable paragraph—a paragraph so exactly in the style of Messrs. Tracy, Cummings, and company, that it looks like a bare-faced plagiarism:

'We wish to see the cause move onward by the propelling force of truth and argument, and not by a spirit of domineering. We are opposed to the press-gang system of doing things as much as we are to gag-law. We wish simply to pour light on the understanding, and love into the hearts of men, and in this way to move them to exert their influence in behalf of oppressed humanity. We shall be exceedingly unwilling to employ slave-labor in carrying forward the work of emancipation; and hence do not wish to see those who are not yet ready to lend us their aid, scolded and lashed up to the work. A pouring forth of light, with the meekness of Christ and the patience of hope, will, in our humble opinion, do the work much better and with far greater despatch, than any measures which look like an attempt to coerce.'

The 'Appeal' laments 'the abuse which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies.' For one, I protest against this companionship. I would admonish these gentlemen, that it does not properly follow as a sound corollary, that because some men are (or profess to be) 'ministers of the gospel,' therefore they are 'excellent Christians!' The fact, as new developments are constantly showing, seems to be exactly the reverse. Christianity indignantly rejects the sanctimonious pretensions of the great mass of the clergy in our land. It is becoming more and more apparent, that they are nothing better than hirelings, in the bad sense of that term—that they are blind leaders of the blind, dumb dogs that cannot bark, spiritual popes—that they love the fleece better than the flock—that they are mighty hindrances to the march of human freedom, and to the enfranchisement of the souls of men. There are many splendid exceptions to this general rule,—exceptions which do honor to the cause of God, and are worthy of all praise. But woe to the spiritual popes, the wolves in sheep's clothing! Their overthrow is registered upon the scroll of destiny.

The authors of the 'Appeal' think it 'does not become abolitionists to call men of acknowledged piety and great worth of character, hypocrites and knaves, because they do not just now see eye to eye with those who have had most to do in the cause of anti-slavery.' Certainly it does not—but when have abolitionists done so? Have these gentlemen forgotten their own favorite maxim, that 'insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying'? Whenever I have launched my denunciations against individuals, they have been levelled at the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, those who sit in Moses's seat and love to be called Rabbi, and not at publicans and sinners. In this particular, I have endeavored to imitate the example of Christ, and to manifest the same righteous indignation, and have had the honor to be assailed in return with the cry, 'Release not this man, but Barabbas! Away with him! Crucify him!' What shall be said of such men as Moses Stuart and Wilbur Fisk, who maintain that a system which comes

from the bottomless pit is of heavenly origin, and legalized by the scriptures? Can any epithets be too severe to apply to them? Has not even Mr. Fitch declared, that 'if the long-suffering patience of a forbearing God was ever insulted beyond endurance,' it must be in just such cases as these, when professedly Christian ministers are neither afraid nor ashamed to

'Torture the pages of the hallowed Bible,
To sanction crime, and robbery, and blood,
And in oppression's hateful service, libel
Both man and God!'

I repeat it—I have not denounced any man, or minister of the gospel, merely because he is not connected with the anti-slavery cause, *but only when he has advocated slavery as being in accordance with republicanism and the gospel.*

Mr. Fitch and his associates say—'The time is very fully in our recollection, when we were not abolitionists, [what were they? in favor of slavery?]—nor are we conscious that we were then either hypocrites or knaves.' And pray, gentlemen, who ever accused you of being such?

8. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as a 'clerical' Bull. Its authors, if they had duly considered the character of abolitionists, would not have been so impolitic as to put on their sacerdotal robes, and assume an ecclesiastical air of authority, in proceeding to bestow their censures. Abolitionism brings ministers and laymen upon the same dead level of equality, and repudiates all 'clerical' assumption, all spiritual supremacy. Nothing can be more offensive to it, than this attempt to enforce opinions in an oracular tone, as **CLERGYMEN**. It knows nothing of 'Clerical Abolitionists,' *par excellence*. It abhors caste as Nature does a vacuum, and is a terrible leveller of distinctions.

Finally, it is intimated in the 'Appeal,' that, 'unless a different course is pursued, many who, in times past, have labored much in this cause, will withdraw in despair, and weep in secret places.' Faithful followers of Christ they must be, if, because others persist in doing wrong, they themselves shall cease to uphold a righteous cause! If there be any such, they can withdraw *ad libitum*. There will be no 'attempt to coerce' them to remain, for abolitionists 'are opposed to the press-gang system of doing things, as much as they are to gag-law.' Their motto is **FREE DISCUSSION—FREE ACTION—AND GOD DEFEND THE RIGHT!**

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Brooklyn, (Conn.) Aug. 8th. 1837.

TO MESSRS. FITCH, SANFORD, CORNELL, PERKINS, AND TOWNE:

BRETHREN,—Your recent Appeal has not only surprised and grieved me, but imposed on me a task, from which I would gladly have been exempt. Opposition from avowed opponents is to be expected;

and to contend with and meet it, is comparatively easy and pleasant! But it is far otherwise when one's familiar friend lifts up his heel against him.—In such case, the task of resistance is difficult, trying and unwelcome, and one's heart instinctively shrinks from it, or is ready to die within him as he undertakes it. Difficult, trying and unwelcome as it may be, however, there are cases in which it must be done, and in which silence would be treachery and guilt. Such, in my judgment, is the present case; and therefore much as I might desire exemption, I feel myself constrained to the task I have undertaken.

It is true your Appeal is addressed to no one and to no number of individuals particularly; nor does it profess to speak of the doings of any one or any particular number of such individuals. It is merely a protest against the 'movements of some leading abolitionists,' leaving it for every one to guess who and how many, whether two or twenty, are included in the censure. This to be sure, for men who 'have no sympathy with those who make an indiscriminate use of' severe 'epithets,' is rather an indefinite and indiscriminate censure; and as I am not conscious of guilt in the particular matters charged, nor of being particularly worthy of the character of a leader among abolitionists, I may be going on a fool's errand, in volunteering a defence. If so, I can only say that the indefiniteness of the censure must be my apology, and that the fact that I now occupy the position of general agent of the Mass. A. S. Society, seems to render it my appropriate duty to undertake the defence. Meanwhile, I beg you, in any subsequent communications you may have occasion to make to the public, to *specify persons and things*. If you mean me, say so. If you mean Mr. Garrison, say so. If you mean some body else, say so, and give us the name. Do not crowd innocent and guilty together under the broad and indefinite phraseology of 'some leading abolitionists.' Such generalities, interpreted as they are by our opponents to mean any and every one, at best suits their convenience, 'do *injustice* to individuals and are *great hindrances to our work*,' and I beg you no more to deal in such 'indiscriminate' censure.

And now, brethren, in entering on an examination of your Appeal, let me say, that I exceedingly regret, that our opponents have found in you champions for the preference of charges and the defence of positions, which should have been preferred and defended by themselves, and which seem to me unfounded and unsound. 'Divide and conquer' is an old and a successful policy, I know, but surely abolitionists have, or ought to have enough to do, to fight their own battles, without volunteering to fight the battles of their enemies, and giving them occasion to exult in their defence. If, however, in the particular matters in question, you and our enemies are *agreed*, much as I am grieved at the fact, and at the position in which it places you, and positive as

I am of your error in the case, yet be assured I sincerely rejoice that you have spoken out. I could have wished indeed, that in the frankness and honesty of Christian brethren, you had at least conferred with 'some leading abolitionists' on the particular matters in question, which, with a single exception and in reference to a single point, you have not done; and that before sending forth your *public* protest in the case, you should have tried what virtue there is in private conference and brotherly remonstrance. As it is, however, it is some comfort to know, even in an unpleasant and painful way, what you are and where you stand. And here let me add, that grieved as I should be, to have you, or any others 'who, in times past, have labored much in this cause, withdraw in despair, and weep in secret places,' yet I, for one, shall not depart from what I believe to be true and right, to keep you. The strength of our cause lies in principle, and not in numbers. Such has ever been the maxim of 'leading abolitionists,' and that will be regarded by them as a disastrous day, when from a respect of persons or of usages, they allow themselves to depart from a steadfast adherence to truth and right, in order to gain or keep you or any body else. You will allow me then, in what I have farther to say, in reference to your extraordinary Appeal, to use great plainness of speech, and to tell you all my heart—even my suspicions, (provided I give you the reasons for them,) as well as the things that I know. In the outset then, I have a word to say of

THE SIGNERS TO THE APPEAL.

Mr. Perkins is understood not to have approved of all that was in it, but to have signed it, simply because, notwithstanding the objectionable things, he approved of it as a whole. As to Mr. Cornell, it is presumed that he would not have signed it, had he not been 'known' by somebody, 'in public and private as a friend of the anti-slavery cause.' I will only say, he was never so known by 'some leading abolitionists.'

Of the Appeal itself, the first part is understood to have been written by Mr. Fitch, and the second, and larger part, by Mr. Towne; the others signed it, as it was made to their hands, and were dependent on them, I suppose, for their information respecting the matters of fact in question—particularly those touching Messrs. Blagden and White.

And now, having disposed of these preliminaries, let me say, that I am happy to have your testimony to certain points of doctrine, which I deem of great importance, and to certain matters of fact, which, to my mind, are cheering indications of

PROGRESS IN THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM. They are these:

1. That 'slavery under all circumstances, and at all times, is a loud-crying, and exceedingly aggravated sin,' and 'ought to be at once and forever abandoned.'

2. That it is an 'iniquitous system of robbery and

WRONG' and 'worthy only of UNIVERSAL and ETERNAL ABHORRENCE.'

3. That it is 'one of the most direct and powerful hindrances to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.'

4. That 'the cause of immediate emancipation is founded in righteousness and truth.'

So much for doctrine; and to show that these doctrines have laid fast hold of the public conscience, I am happy to know, on your testimony, in the fifth place, that to publish a man as a slaveholder, whether he is guilty or innocent, and especially if he is guilty, is 'to tarnish his character with the stain of 'sin,' and 'to hold him up to universal abhorrence.' This is as it should be. Slavery is 'robbery and wrong,' and the slaveholder, be he Christian or infidel, saint or sinner, minister or layman, is a robber and a wrong-doer of the worst possible character. If he is a gentleman, clothed in silks and broad-cloth, and living sumptuously on the spoils of his victims, he is a gentlemanly robber. If he is a learned, intelligent, pious, devoted, praying, godly minister, why then he is a learned, intelligent, pious, devoted, praying, godly, ministerial robber. And his learning, intelligence, piety, &c., so far from changing the nature of his offence, or being its mitigation, are its highest possible aggravation. If he were some poor, ignorant being, that knew no better, there might be some apology, but when he boasts his intelligence, his piety, and his office, he just glories in his shame. He boasts that which writes him down 'without excuse,' and marks him the guiltiest of the guilty. And the only difference between him and other robbers of the same kind is, that in addition to the first robbery, he 'steals the livery of heaven to serve the devil in,' and they do not. Be the man then who or what he may in other respects, if he holds his fellow-man as property, he is a robber of the worst possible character. He is as much worse than a highway robber, as the man himself, purse and all, is of more value than the purse; and he should be regarded and treated accordingly.—His crime is no 'domestic' or 'personal' affair merely, but a public offence against God and man, and like that of the highway robber and slave-trader, it ought every where to be a forfeiture of character and standing in society.

And, brethren, be assured it is no small gratification to learn, and on your authority, that even in Boston, to be known as a slaveholder, is to have one's character *tarnished*, and to be an object of 'universal abhorrence;' nay, that even the 'insinuation' of the thing is a 'thrust at a man's reputation,' so fatal that if unfounded it is 'wicked' and 'base,' and is a 'sin' of such crimson dye, that you would 'be ashamed to lift up your heads as abolitionists, if you failed to rebuke it.' Obviously if the bare suspicion of this crime has come to be thus fatal to character, the cause of freedom has made

progress; for the time was when it was rather an honor to be the owner of men.

Add to this, that while ministers, as they should, have, and exercise the right to invite whom they please into their pulpit, the people also, in the exercise of their right to hear whom they please, are coming extensively to the determination that they will not hear the man-stealer; and verily the day seems at hand, when righteousness and freedom shall triumph, and the plunderer of God's poor become an outlaw from the society of honest men, and an object of 'universal and eternal abhorrence.' 'God shall cast upon him and not spare. Men shall clap their hands at him, and shall hiss him out of his place.' (Job xxvii, 22, 23.)

THINGS IN WHICH WE AGREE. There are some things also in your Appeal, with which I am happy to say *all* the leading 'abolitionists' with whom I am acquainted most fully agree. They are as follows:

1. That 'to hold a man up to universal abhorrence,' whether it be Rev. Mr. White, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, or any one else, 'while neither time nor pains have been taken to ascertain the truth in relation to him, is altogether unjustifiable;' and that an 'attempt to tarnish his character with the sin of slaveholding,' or that of 'hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation,' or that of 'the meanest and vilest form of lying,' 'when he has never been guilty of it,' is 'decidedly wrong,' and that no man's 'reputation is safe in the hands' of men who do such things.

2. That 'insinuations, thrown before the world in print, because somebody happened to guess that all was not right, cannot be justified,' whether they have reference to the sin of slaveholding or to that of insinuation itself. 'To insinuate' that somebody else has insinuated, 'while they have no proof of it,' and 'neither time nor pains have been taken to ascertain the truth in the case,' is itself 'insinuation,' and involves its author in all the severities of his own condemnation, even that of a 'wicked' and 'base thrust at a man's reputation,' by 'the meanest and vilest form of lying;' and it ought, most surely, to set him to 'loath'-ing himself! Thou that teachest another should not insinuate, dost thou insinuate?

3. That 'a pouring forth of light with the meekness of Christ, and the patience of hope' is the true way to advance any and every good cause, and that 'men of acknowledged piety and great worth of character' should by no means be called 'hypocrites and knaves, because they do not just *now* see eye to eye with those who have most to do' with the particular cause in question. By no means. Fair trial should be made and fair opportunity given. Light should be poured forth on the right hand and on the left, and be made to blaze on their vision with the clearness of the noon-day sun. If they welcome it, well; then do they prove themselves 'children of the light,' and their acknowledged, to

be their real character. If, however, in the spirit of certain men of old, they say 'thou wert altogether born in sin and dost thou teach us?' or in that of others, 'can any good come out of Nazareth?' or 'is not this the Carpenter's son?' and for these or any other reasons, turn their back and shut their eyes upon the light, and, like owls and bats, hide away, and grope and slumber on at noon-day, and that too after years of unwearied effort to enlighten them, then indeed do they prove themselves 'children of the night,' and their acknowledged, not to be their real character; and if, in the meekness of Christ, we may not call them 'hypocrites,' vipers,' &c., because they 'do not just *now* see eye to eye,' we may at least declare that, because they 'do not just' then after years of resistance and rejection of the light 'see eye to eye,' 'this is' their 'condemnation, that light has come into the world,' and that they 'have loved darkness rather than light, because,' on this particular subject at least, 'their deeds are evil,' and they, whatever their protestations to the contrary, are after all PRO-SLAVERY MEN!

4. That 'abuse' should not be 'heaped upon ministers of the gospel and other excellent Christians,' because 'they do not feel prepared to enter *fully* into the efforts of anti-slavery societies.'

5. That 'a spirit of domineering'—'the press-gang system'—'slave labor'—'scourging and lashing,' and attempts to coerce, are not the weapons of a Christian warfare.

6. That the right of judgment in the matter of giving notices rests with the minister. 'He has a right' and I would add, it is his duty, 'to be his own judge' as to what he will, and what he will not read.

7. That 'no man or body of men can, with any propriety, command him to announce their appointments.'

8. That no 'regard' should be paid, by him or any body else, 'to the authoritative mandates of men,' be they laymen, 'leading abolitionists,' or clergymen, but that all men should be governed, 'in all things, by Christian principles.'

9. That 'when in the pulpit of his brother clergyman,' he should never be guilty of paying 'no regard to his rights,' much less that he should ever 'trample' upon them.

On all these points, I think we are most fully agreed. I know not the 'leading' abolitionist that would not assent to them most heartily. There is no dispute here. But alas, when I look again I am astonished and grieved at what I see. Why, brethren, what do I find? Christian brethren and Christian ministers charging their brother Christians, and as I suppose 'some leading abolitionists,' was meant to include some ministers, their brethren in the ministry, with 'hasty, unsparing and almost ferocious denunciation;' with holding men up to 'universal abhorrence,' and 'attempt to tarnish'

their 'character,' with the stain of sins of which they were 'never guilty,' while 'neither time nor pains have been taken to ascertain the truth;' with 'insinuations' on the strength only of somebody's 'guess,' and without 'proof;' with 'wicked and base thrusts at a man's reputation;' with 'monstrous injustice,' and the commission of a 'sin' that you would be 'ashamed' not to rebuke; with 'the attempt to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood,' yea even by 'the meanest and vilest form of lying;' with attempts, not 'as orderly' or 'decent,' as they might be, to make the minister 'a town-crier,' and 'command him' to do their bidding; with 'a spirit of domineering,' a 'tone of demand,' the raising of 'an outcry,' the application of 'slave labor' and 'the press-gang system;' with scourging and lashing men to the work, and the adoption of 'measures which look like an attempt to coerce;' with a wish to have ministers 'pay no regard' to a brother minister's 'rights,' when in his pulpit; with a 'tone of demand upon others to surrender up their rights;' with 'the abandonment of highly important objects,' that they may bestow *all* upon the specific object of emancipation; and with the heaping of 'abuse upon ministers of the gospel and other excellent Christians,' by an 'indiscriminate use' of severe 'epithets.' Truly here is a sad list of offences and to charge them on any man, much more on any body of men indiscriminately, is no light matter. One of your number did, it is true, some weeks ago, have some conversation with me on the general topic of 'abuse;' but with that exception, and in relation to the other topics which constitute the burden of your protest, not one of you is remembered to have ever said aught in the way of private remonstrance, to any of the individuals implicated in the particular matters named. And now I put it to your consciences to say, whether it be fair, or manly, or Christian, to write Christian brethren in the ministry, down before the public, as denunciators, insinulators, domineers, slave-drivers, liars, &c., 'while neither time nor pains have been taken,' to try the virtue of affectionate and private remonstrance, nor even 'to ascertain the truth' in the case? As you have however seen fit to do so, ('in the meekness of Christ and the patience of hope' I presume,) allow me to say that if these charges are true, and some leading abolitionists are what you represent them, you have indeed done well in exposing their misdeeds, and should by all means complete the work you have begun, by abjuring them altogether. What! will you company with denunciators and insinulators and liars of the 'meanest and vilest kind?' If, however, your charges are *untrue*, then have you done 'great injustice to individuals,' and to the cause of the slave, and your Appeal is really little else than one continued tissue of 'hasty, unsparing and almost ferocious denunciation' and 'insinuation,' and should by all means have been so entitled. Under these cir-

cumstances therefore, I am obliged, however reluctantly, to call your attention to

SOME THINGS THAT ARE NOT TRUE. And,

1. It is not true that 'leading abolitionists' are infallible, or that they claim to be so. On the contrary, they are deeply conscious of their fallibility, and are therefore ever ready to make reparation of injury done and correction of error committed. Even recently, in the case of Mr. Blagdon, as soon as they had any contradiction as well founded and direct as the rumor they promptly published it. They did it too before they knew aught of your Appeal. And had you asked it, the Appeal itself would have been cheerfully inserted in the paper, in which the bad things it was intended to correct made their appearance, instead of being sent to another paper and another class of readers, who with some exceptions, were qualified to judge of the correctness or incorrectness of your censure.

2. It is not true 'that neither time nor pains' were 'taken to ascertain the truth in relation' to Mr. White. 'Time and pains were taken to be assured of the 'truth' in the case, (see Reply of Editor pro tem. of Liberator,) and had you taken the 'time' or the 'pains' to make a single inquiry, you might have known it.

3. It is not true that an 'attempt' was made 'to tarnish his character' with a sin of which he was 'never guilty.' There was and still is, (see the Reply, &c.) the most undoubted evidence of his guilt. It is in evidence unquestionable, that on his return to the south one season, he wrote back to his brother, now in Randolph, giving an account of the misconduct of his slaves, (or slaves that he called his) and of the punishment that he inflicted on his house servant, a woman (!) for her misconduct, and that that brother, on a subsequent occasion, told Mr. White, that it was his treatment of that woman which made him, what he now is, an abolitionist.

4. It is not true, therefore, that any one has been guilty of 'hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation,' in this case. All that was done, was, on good authority for the fact, to call a clerical slaveholder, 'a clerical man-thief and robber;' and when good brother Fitch, who penned this part of the Appeal, takes back and repents of what he said, July 4th, 1836, (Address, p. 21, 22,) viz. that 'he who strips another of his rights, or withholds them from him, is a thief and a robber; the *worst thief and the worst robber upon which the sun has ever shone since God hung it in the heavens;*' when he takes back his declaration, that slaveholders are 'like *wolves* ravening the prey, to shed blood and to destroy souls, to get dishonest gain; and that the prophets have daubed them with untempered mortar, seeing vanity and divining *lies* unto them;' when he recalls the outcry, 'come on, one and all, let us raise the trump of truth, and blow a resurrection blast above [the slaveholder's dead conscience].'

that shall call it forth from its dust, to take up its whip of scorpions, and SCOURGE the guilty men into obedience to the command of God ;" and when he stops praying 'for a voice like a volcano, and for words that would SCORCH and BURN like drops of MELTED LAVA, that he may THUNDER the guilt of the slaveholder in his ears, and talk to him in language which he would FEEL!' (See Slaveholding weighed in the Balance, pp. 23, 34, 36)—when he does any or all of these things, it will then be in time for him to renounce the application of his own 'denunciations.' And if the complaint is that they have been applied to the innocent and not to the guilty, the reply is, let that fact be proved and the evidence of guilt be done away, and all suitable amends will be promptly and cheerfully made.

5. It is not true, that 'insinuations' were 'thrown before the world' in respect to Mr. Blagden, 'because somebody happened to guess that all was not right.' The truth is that the rumor had been in circulation for months, and had come to the ears of thousands, and all this 'time' no notice had been taken of it 'in print'—no 'insinuations' had been made, no inquiries put. It was mere unauthenticated rumor, and as such, 'the conductors of the Liberator,' did not feel authorized even to propound inquiry. A few weeks since, a clergymen, of respectability and undoubted veracity, when something was incidentally said upon the subject, stated that he had it from a lady, whose informant had it from Mr. Blagden himself, that with the patrimonial estate, he had inherited, in whole or in part, the slave woman that nursed him. On the strength of the rumor thus confirmed and authenticated, and without 'insinuation' or 'lying,' the inquiry was made whether he was or was not a slaveholder. Had the rumor been confined to a few, a public inquiry might have been spared, but extended as it was to hundreds and thousands, it was but fair to give an opportunity, if it could be done, for its explicit contradiction, and if it could not be done, to let Mr. B. bear the responsibility of his crime. And why should he not? He maintains, and has so assured me, not that our measures are the only thing that prevent his being 'identified' with us but that our fundamental principle, that slaveholding 'under all circumstances and at all times is sin,' is wrong, and that under some circumstances slaveholding is right and justifiable. Why then should he shrink from reducing his *principles to practice*? and why should you regard it as calling 'about firebrands, arrows and death,' and as a 'wicked and base thrust at his reputation,' for a man to ask whether he *practices* what he *preaches*? Is it true, that he is ashamed or afraid to do so; and that he feels himself aggrieved and his character assailed by the least intimation that he has done it? And have he and Mr. White come to you, in the bitterness of grief and the extremity of distress, and

bogged a defence at your hands? Or have you run before you were sent in the matter, and volunteered a defence, without even knowing whether they would thank you for it, or indeed would not consider it as grave an impeachment of their character, as the charge itself? Be this as it may, let me add, that for myself, I took an early opportunity to make personal inquiry of Mr. B. on the subject, and was answered, on condition that I should not make use of the answer, though if I had been permitted to do it, it might, perhaps, have removed some difficulties add 'satisfied' some doubts.

6. It is not true, that 'leading abolitionists' do, or 'would withhold their prayers and aid from' the mission, bible, tract, and other kindred causes, 'that they may bestow all up on the specific object of emancipation.' As to 'prayer,' all share it alike. And as to 'aid,' the only claim ever urged, and the only appeal ever put forth, are the very ones now put forth and urged by the A. B. C. F. Missions, viz. that special necessities constitute a ground for special claims, and that those on whom the responsibility of the enterprise mainly and specially rests, should therefore for the time being, turn their aid *mainly* into that channel. I know not the abolitionist, leading or otherwise, who asks or ever has asked, that 'all prayer,' or 'aid,' even should be turned into the abolition channel, to 'the abandonment' of the other 'important objects.' Nor can I even 'guess' on what ground you venture this *unqualified and sweeping charge* against your brethren.

7. It is not true that 'leading abolitionists' have demanded that ministers 'surrender up their rights,' or 'trample' on the rights of their brethren. They have only asked that ministers should not trample on their people's rights on the one hand, nor 'surrender up their own rights,' to ministerial usage on the other. And when, on these subjects, there has been a difference of opinion, they have only asked, what they have cheerfully given, the right to express their opinion, and by a trial of strength in the field of discussion, to see who has the best of the argument.

8. Nor is it true, that in urging this or any other part of their warfare, they have put on the 'tone of demand,' or 'the spirit of domineering,' or 'scourged and lashed men to the work,' or sought to carry their points by the 'press-gang system' and 'attempts to coerce.' They have only claimed and exercised the liberty of plain dealing, without respect of persons or things,—the liberty claimed by yourselves of 'a full, faithful, fearless, and uncompromising declaration of the truth, and the whole truth.' In so doing they have doubtless, sometimes erred. But with all their errors, to characterize their course, as you have done above, and that too, when they have ever held themselves ready, on due authority, to make correction of error and reparation of injury, is, I will not say 'insinuation' or 'lying,' but is, I must say, an ungenerous and injurious censure of brethren.

And here permit me, as it may serve somewhat to explain your feelings on these particular topics, to remind you of a fact in the experience of mind. It is this, that when a man holds back from the discharge of a duty to which his conscience, as well as those around is continually urging him, he feels as if somebody was continually *pushing* and *forcing* him along. Whisper *guilt*, in respect to the matter, suddenly in his ear, and he feels almost as if you had struck him. Let him understand deliberately that you think he ought to do it, and however he may defend his course and try to reconcile it with conscience, yet there is a something within that makes him feel as if somebody was *pushing* and *forcing* him on, and he vainly imagines it is you, when after all, it is only the somebody within him, responding to your opinion. And now, brother Towne, as this part of the protest was written by yourself and is doubtless specially expressive of your feelings, you will allow me to say, that I fear such is precisely your condition. Since your reception and acceptance of the call to the Salem street Church, you have carefully kept aloof from anti-slavery meetings. At the New England Convention in May, which continued its sessions through four successive days, although specially invited to it, no voice was heard from you in behalf of the suffering and the dumb. It is not known indeed that you were present at any of the meetings. Throughout your policy from the time specified has been almost if not entirely that of silence and withdrawal, as to any public advocacy of the cause and any public identification with the friends of the oppressed. You have attempted, I know, to justify this course, and have probably persuaded yourself of its consistency with duty. Yet you are aware that some 'leading abolitionists' condemn it. You remember your own liability to err. You take up the Bible. It is hard work to make it read, 'Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy,'—*except*, when under a call to some church; 'By their fruits shall we know them'—*except*, &c.! Somehow, with the Bible open before it, conscience will not be exactly satisfied with silence under such circumstances, and you find yourself, ere you are aware of it, put upon argument in self-defence, and feel as if somebody was contending with and *forcing* you along. Take care, brother! Don't mistake 'some leading abolitionists' for the somebody within, responding to their opinion, and urging you to duty.

NOTICES.—OBLIGATION TO READ THEM.

And now, brethren, I am entering on topics that are vital, not merely to the cause of abolition, but to that of freedom generally, civil and religious; and it is with the deepest regret that I find you defending positions so untenable in their character, so pernicious in their tendencies, and so disastrous, if unresisted, in their results. Their discussion however can do no harm. I trust, indeed, it will

rather do good, and will serve to lead us all to a better understanding and a more scrupulous regard for each other's rights. Let me call your attention then,

1. To the 'obligation' resting on you and every minister to read notices of anti-slavery meetings. Some of these are notices of lectures and meetings for public discussion, and are of course, an invitation to the congregation generally to attend. Others are simply notices of the meetings of some anti-slavery society for the transaction of business. These of course, are only an invitation to particular individuals, and their reading is requested merely to advertise persons, whose convictions on the subject are already settled, of the time and place at which they are to meet for the discharge of what they consider a *solemn and religious duty*. But whether the object be the one or the other, the affording of facilities for a discharge of conscientious duty or something more, and whether the reading be desired as a matter of obligation and duty, or merely as one of common civility and Christian courtesy, in either or in both cases, they are grouped together as 'anti-slavery notices,' and refused a reading by a portion of the ministry in Boston and vicinity. And with reference to this conduct, I find you, not only severely censuring those who presume to question or condemn it, but justifying and upholding those who are guilty of it. You hardly *intimate* even that it is their duty to read such notices, much less urge them to it, and censure them for a refusal. You 'should indeed rejoice if they felt it to be their duty to do every thing in their power to help forward the cause of immediate emancipation,' but if, on the contrary, they refuse to read notices, and 'do every thing' else 'in their power' to retard it, not a word of rebuke have they from you. They may turn their back and shut their ear to the cry of the oppressed and oppose abolitionists to their hearts content, and they are only 'men who have a quick sense of propriety'—their hearts bleed for the oppressed,' and after all it is only 'because they do not just now see eye to eye with us!' The storm of censure is all heaped upon those who dare to question or condemn their course, while they receive at your hands nothing but apology, excuse, and justification!

You 'know of no obligation resting on any minister to make himself a town-crier or his pulpit a vehicle for public information. 'He has a right to be his own judge in such matters'—(as if that absolved him from responsibility for the *abuse* of his right;) 'no man or body of men can *command* him to announce their appointments;' and as for ourselves, *we* 'shall consult our own judgment; *we* 'shall pay no regard to the authoritative mandates of men,' and 'shall give such notices when *we think it advisable and only then!*' Really, brethren this style of talking does not seem to savor much of 'the meekness of Christ,' or 'the patience of hope.'

As you have however declared that you 'know of no obligation resting on any minister' to read the notices in question, and have even spoken of your reading them in your own pulpits, not as a matter of obligation, but only something you 'have been accustomed' to do; and as in all this you have done what you could to relieve our opponents of responsibility and acquit them of guilt in the case, it is important to examine the question, with carefulness and prayer. And if, in so doing, you should be satisfied of your error, I hope that no threats of ministerial exclusion or ecclesiastical censure, and no ties of clerical association or personal friendship, will prevent its prompt confession and renunciation.

If then you put the matter on the ground of *expediency* simply, as a matter not involving principle, but purely one of convenience, to be done or not, as shall seem 'advisable,' then I insist

1. That every minister is *bound in courtesy* to read such notices. Why should he not? Does he assert for himself, the right of private judgment on all questions of truth and duty? Does he deny, utterly and forever, the right of any man or set of men to think for him and lord it over his conscience? Does he stand in stout resistance to any invasion, in reference to himself, of the apostolic injunction, 'prove all things, hold fast that which is good?' Does he protest against any and every thing of this kind, come it from church or state, as an invasion of his civil or ecclesiastical rights, and as being itself civil or ecclesiastical despotism? And yet will he not accede the same right to others, even the humblest and wickedest of his flock? What! is he *afraid* to have men 'prove all things?' Dare he not *trust others* with the same rights he claims for himself? Is he the only object of apostolic injunction; the only safe depository of the right of private judgment? Or, according this right to others, is he so dead to apostolic injunction, and so lost to common courtesy, that he will not extend to them, however he and they may differ on the subject in question, the cheap civility of announcing at their request the time and place at which they and others who wish, may meet together, for the obedience of the injunction and the exercise of their right? Shame, shame, on such inconsistency and intolerance! It befits the papist, not the protestant, and is neither manly, generous, nor Christian.

Tell me not, brethren, of the *number* of the notices in question—as if they were so many as to make the minister 'a town-crier.' It is not their number that constitutes the ground of refusal. Were it so, they would at least be read *occasionally*—whenever it could be done without *too large* a draft on the time of the audience and the strength of the preacher!

I would here recommend those who are afraid of being made 'town-criers,' or, to use the elegant phrase of one of them, 'pack-horses,' by being asked

the cheap civility of giving a notice, to make a morning meditation of the following.

'Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them: but it shall not be so among you. Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.—If I then your Lord and Master, have washed your foot, ye also ought to wash one another's feet.' And when these brethren have drank so deeply of 'the meekness of Christ' as to be willing to be town-foot-washers to the disciples, I for one, will most cheerfully listen to any complaints they may have to make about town-crier and pack-horse-ship, because they are asked to give a notice!

Tell me not here either of cases of conscience. For by the supposition, the matter is now one of convenience and expedience, to be done or not, as seems 'advisable' morally. And if in this aspect of the case, the minister feels *the* giving the notice would be lending a sanction, in whole or in part, to what he cannot approve, let him say so; let him, if he will, bear his testimony fully against it, and say expressly that he gives no sanction in the case, but the reverse, and that he reads the notice only as a matter of courtesy, and by particular request, and thus show him a man, and not a bigot, or a slave.

If however you put this matter on the score of principle, then I maintain,

2. That under existing circumstances, and as a general rule, every minister is under solemn obligation to read such notices, (1) as a testimony in defence of the assailed right of discussion, and (2) as a testimony against slavery itself. I speak now with particular reference to his own pulpit; and what I mean by 'existing circumstances' &c. will be obvious as I proceed. In his own pulpit, as well as elsewhere, the minister has, in the fullest sense, the right of private judgment. In its exercise, however, he is bound to judge righteously; and if he fails to do so he involves himself in guilt. The possession of the right is not exemption from responsibility in its exercise. I insist then, that in his own pulpit, as elsewhere, the commands of God, —'Love thy neighbor as thyself; cry aloud and spare not; open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy,' and the claims of a common humanity alike impose an obligation, not only to cry aloud himself on behalf of the oppressed, but to *help others* who are doing the same. He may no more refuse to *help them*, than he may refuse to 'cry aloud' himself. The obligation, in each case, is one and the same—viz. an obligation to do all he can for the relief of the oppressed. If he can do something to this end by the reading of anti-slavery notices, then, on two conditions now to be named, he is bound to do it; and if doing it makes him a 'town crier' he must be one, and magnify his office too by 'crying aloud and sparing

not,' or he violates the commands of God. Those conditions are, 1. That the fundamental principles advanced by the advocate of the oppressed, are as a whole true, or that he leaves the door of discussion open in his meetings, and gives truth liberty to combat error; and 2. That the manner of his advocacy is, on the whole, Christian. These conditions existing in each particular case, make the obligation to *help*, according to one's ability, binding and complete.

Nor, in determining whether they do exist, in any case, may we insist on perfection in matter or manner, and nuke a man, or a set of men, offenders for a word. To do so is straining at gnats and rebuking men who cast out devils in the name of Christ, because they do not do it in our particular way.

Nor where these conditions do *actually* exist, will a man's *conviction* that they do not, absolve him from blame? It is true that as long as his conviction is what it is, he cannot be expected to act contrary to it. His guilt lies, not in acting according to his conviction, but in having such a conviction. With the facts before him, or within his reach, he ought to judge differently. If he does not he is to blame. He has no right to a wrong conviction in the case. And if in accordance with *such* conviction he refuses to read a notice, others are at liberty, if they deem it duty, to controvert that conviction, and to blame him, not indeed for acting on his conviction, but for his conviction itself. Nor is it "raising an outcry" against him to do so. It is but doing what you ought to have done in your Appeal, and what Paul did to Peter, withstanding brethren "to the face, because they are to be blamed." (Gal. 2: 11.)

It is true, the simple act of giving a notice seems a trifling affair; and in some aspects and in some circumstances it is so; but under other aspects and in circumstances that make it the adoption or rejection, the approval or disapproval, the sanction or condemnation of great *principles*, it is far otherwise. It is a trifling matter to pay a three-penny tax on tea; but when that act involves or sanctions a great principle—the embryo element of oppression without limit or end—it then becomes a matter of magnitude enough to rouse a nation. Under ordinary circumstances, it was a very indifferent matter whether Daniel prayed twice or three times a day, whether he did it on his knees or standing, mentally or orally, in his chamber or somewhere else, and with his windows open or shut. The mere mode and form were nothing. But when the decree of the king was out, then to vary one iota in the *mode* of prayer, much more in the *matter*; was homage to *imperial usage* and *denial of his God*, and Daniel accordingly, with "wisdom like unto the wisdom of the gods," went

into his chamber, and regardless of the lion's den, prayed "AS he did aforetime." On a certain occasion also, three hundred soldiers in Madagascar, who had cast off idolatry and embraced Christianity, were ordered with the rest of the army to march to another part of the island to quell an insurrection that had broken out. According to national usage, the national idol was to pass in procession before the army, and they were to be sprinkled in holy water in which the idol had been dipped. Not to make the token of homage and allow themselves to be sprinkled as the idol passed along, was to be considered as confederate with the rebels and to doom themselves, for aught they knew, to death. To do it however, though in mere *external act* and not in heart, though from necessity and not from choice, was renunciation of Christianity and *practical idolatry*. And come what might, with wisdom like unto the wisdom of Daniel, they determined not to do it.

External action then however trifling in itself, and however indifferent and unimportant in some aspects and under some circumstances, yet under others which make it the avowal or disavowal, the sanction or condemnation of great principles, is far otherwise. In such case, to do the act is avowal or sanction of the principles, and not to do it, is rejection and condemnation of them. Hence, and with particular reference to such cases, the maxim of common sense and common life, "Actions speak louder than words." Hence too the grand and final test of character of the Savior, "By their fruits shall ye know them;" and with particular reference to cases of the kind in question, "Whoso shall confess me *before men*, &c. but whoso shall deny me *before men*," &c. And this is the rule, and the only one, by which we are at *liberty* to test our own or others' character, and by which Jesus Christ himself will test us at the last day. Desire it as we may, he will not, nor may we allow professions and protestations of the adoption or rejection of great principles to come in and set aside the evidence of action. To do so, is to adopt a standard of *fragment* and a test of character *unknown to the gospel*. Judgment will proceed at the *final* day, and ought to do so now, upon the ground that those principles and those only are adopted by the man, which are embodied in the life, as well as welcomed to the heart, and carried with him, at all times and everywhere, as a part of himself, no more to be put off, concealed, or denied, especially on occasions that test him, than the features of his face or his own personal identity. Of all others it is to action on those occasions and under those circumstances which in themselves constitute a temptation to swerve, that the test applies with most force; and it is to such that it will be applied

at the final day with greatest strictness. Here emphatically the decision of truth and God will be that the act done or not done, as the case might be, was an avowal and sanction, or a rejection and condemnation of the *principles*, and no protestations to the contrary, however sincere or earnest, will or can be allowed to come in in arrest or reversion of judgment.

What then are the circumstances of the present case? Why the nation is moved. In the providence of God, a great question has been put at issue before the people, and they are being called on for their verdict. In respect to it, there are two and only two sets of great principles; and these however many and various in detail, all have their origin in one of two great leading but opposite principles, one of which is, that slaveholding at all times and under all circumstances is sin; the other, that at some times and under some circumstances it is not sin. Here is the starting point of difference throughout; and it is with reference to the truth or falsity of one or the other of these leading principles, that the whole controversy is to be terminated and the verdict of the people rendered. In the moving of this question, slavery has stepped forth in a variety of forms, and commanded silence; and raised a previous question in respect to the right of discussion itself. The right of discussion is thus assailed, and being so, it is every man's duty to step forth to its defence. And as the assault has been made in immediate connection with the question of abolition, the defence should be made there, and every minister, as well as other man, whatever his views on the main subject, is bound, by reading notices of A. S. meetings, and in every other way in his power, to stand by the right of discussion, until the question is settled, that slavery and every other subject is open to debate, and the right itself is inviolable. And as to the question of slavery itself, now that it is still pending and the nation is moved with reference to it, the obligation is on every man, not only to embrace, but, according to his ability and opportunity, to give his public and private testimony to the truth. If the doctrine that slaveholding at all times and under all circumstances is sin be the truth, he is bound by all the obligations of truth, by the claims of suffering humanity and by the commands of God, to embrace the truth, and having done so, to give his "public and private" testimony to it, and especially to do so, on those occasions and under those circumstances, which go to test him and interdict his testimony.

Reading an anti-slavery notice is one of the ways in which he can and is bound to do this. And especially is he bound to do it if on entering a brother's pulpit he finds a clerical usage inter-

dicting his testimony. The hero of '76, paying the tea tax, abjures his principles and becomes a tory. Daniel, omitting prayer or so varying its mode as to conceal it, in homage to *imperial usage*, abjures his principles and denies his God. The believers in Madagascar, sprinkled with holy water in homage to *national usage*, abjure Christianity and deny their Master. The abolitionist minister that puts off his personal identity on stepping into a brother's pulpit, and in homage to *clerical usage*, refuses to read an anti-slavery notice, abjures his principles, becomes for the time being an anti-abolitionist, makes his brother's censure of abolition principles and measures his own, and gives his testimony against the slave. Say what he will, this of all others is the place, where actions speak, and speak louder than words, and where if the man do not *act* himself, he denies himself and abjures his principles, far more effectually, than if he did not *preach* himself.

We come now to another part of the subject,

THE DUTY OF A MINISTER IN THE PULPIT OF HIS BROTHER.

To avoid all misunderstanding here, let me say again, 1. That the minister has, in the fullest sense, the right of private judgment on this and every other question of truth and duty; 2. That the opinions and wishes of "a large portion of his congregation," however they should be respected in matters of mere convenience and expediency, are not to be his rule of judgment and action on other subjects; 3. That a disregard of his rights by a brother clergyman is no justification for a similar disregard in return; 4. That in or out of his brother's pulpit, he should never disregard his "rights." The only question is what are his rights; and this brings us to the point in dispute—viz.

"Is it right for one minister of the gospel to go into another's pulpit, and there take the liberty to do *WHAT* he knows the presiding pastor disapproves? We say, *NO*." Such is your position. True or false, it is at least consistent. There is no blinking of the question. You carry the principle out and take broad ground. That word 'what' means a great deal. It covers *EVERYTHING*. It takes cognizance of the entire man, and sweeps the whole field of expediency, truth, and duty. There is no element in the man that it does not touch, no question in the field of expediency, truth, or duty that it does not cover. For the time, his entire being must be merged in his brother's. He must avow no opinions, express no sentiments, propound no doctrines, enforce no obligations, offer no prayers, perform no actions, recommend no measures, in reference to any subjects, in a word, do nothing in reference to anything that he knows the presiding pastor dis-

approves." His exchange of pulpits must be for the time, an exchange of personal identity itself. In every thing in which they differ, he must deny himself and put on his brother. He may do what he pleases at home. There he is himself, knowing no rule of action but the will of God, no rule of faith and practice but His word. But when he passes the threshold of a brother's pulpit, he steps within another and a paramount jurisdiction. He is himself no longer; and now, by whatever rules his brother may regulate himself, be they good or bad, true or false, of God or man, he must know no law but his good pleasure, and no rule of faith and practice but "*his will!*" No matter if in doing so he is obliged to have as many rules of faith and practice as he has brethren, the moment he passes the threshold he steps within the charmed circle, where, as to him, God's jurisdiction ceases, and a brother's good pleasure vaults into the throne, and in the shape of "**HIS WILL,**" sits as God supreme. That one word "*what,*" broad, unqualified, unrestricted as it is, covers the whole ground. He may do nothing in reference to anything that "he knows the presiding pastor disapproves." Such is the doctrine! To have stated it is its refutation. If you say, you intended the word "*what*" to have reference only to conduct, such as the reading of notices, &c., and not to preaching, the answer is, there is no such limitation in the text or context. And why should there be? Do not actions speak, and in some cases, "speak louder than words?"

Let us however test it a little farther, and see, whether you will be as consistent in your practice as in your theory. You will "read no notices whatever in a brother's pulpit, against his will"—why? Because it would be paying "no regard to his rights." Will you then be consistent, and never invite a brother to your pulpit who, by refusing to read such notices as you wish, "pays no regard to your rights?" True, his doing so is no reason why you should do the same in his pulpit. But it is a reason why you should never invite him to yours. Your rights in the case, admitting them to be so, are the rights of the office, and not of you the individual, separate from it. They are yours only by virtue of the office. They begin, as yours, the moment that the office begins, and end the moment it ends. Their invasion therefore, whether it be made by you in a brother's pulpit, or by him in yours, is in each case an invasion of the rights of the office. It matters not in whose person or in whose pulpit it is done. The offence is in either case the same, an invasion of the rights of the office. Now will you invite a brother to your pulpit, who "pays no regard to your rights" in this matter, and so invite

and encourage, and become accessory before the fact to an invasion of the "rights" of the pastoral office? How dare you?

To invite or to allow the commission of the crime in your own pulpit is tantamount to its commission in your brother's. You have no more right to allow its commission in yours than you have to commit it yourself in his. You have no alternative then but to insist on his coming to your pulpit on the same condition upon which you enter his, viz. compliance with your will, or to refuse him entrance. If you adopt the rule at all, it must be adopted as a rule to work both ways. Will you do it!

Again; let us see what havoc your doctrine on this point makes with your doctrine on other points. You "hope to be governed by Christian principles in this and all other things,"—except "in a brother's pulpit." You "shall pay no regard to the authoritative mandates of men"—except "in a brother's pulpit." "No man or body of men can, with any propriety, command you to announce their appointments," except a brother "in his own pulpit." You "have a right" and "you repeat it, to be your own judge in such matters"—except "in a brother's pulpit." "For a full, faithful, fearless and uncompromising declaration of the truth, and the whole truth, on the subject of slavery, you are always ready"—except "in a brother's pulpit." And you "are willing to identify yourselves with the cause of the oppressed, and to do for them as you, in like circumstances, should wish men to do for you"—except "in a brother's pulpit." There, "his will" must be the circumstance that swallows up all others. So that "principles" or no principles, "propriety" or no propriety, "rights" or no rights, a "declaration of the truth" or no declaration, "identification with the oppressed" or no identification, "**HIS WILL,**" I speak it reverently, is the great I AM, and neither God nor man beside shall make you "do what you know the presiding pastor (Pope?) disapproves!" Really, brethren, it was bad enough for Aaron's rod to eat up the rods of the magicians, but if, like your doctrine, it had gone to eating up itself, it would have left poor Aaron in a sorry plight!

Nor, seriously, does your doctrine make less fearful havoc with the word of God. You enter the pulpit of a slaveholder or an anti-abolitionist. Now let me show you your position in the form of dialogue.

God. "Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction—plead the cause of the poor and needy."

Minister. I can't do that, Lord, I am "in a brother's pulpit."

God. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet."

Min. I'm "in a brother's pulpit."

God. Slavery is "a tremendous mass, one of the most direct and powerful hindrances to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom;" therefore, "Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare the way, take up the stumbling block out of the way."

Min. I'm "in a brother's pulpit."

God. And "is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and *this* house lie waste? Now therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, consider your ways."

Min. I'm "in a brother's pulpit."

God. "Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves? And he said, he that showed mercy on him—go and do thou likewise."

Min. I'm "in a brother's pulpit."

God. "Feed then the flock of the slaughter," and "execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my *fiery* go out like fire and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your DOINGS."

Min. Lord, what other "doings" can I have. I'm "in a brother's pulpit." How can I go "against his will," and dare to do "what he disapproves?" Brethren, it is no light matter to assert and act upon a doctrine, which, in respect to yourselves, and in turn in respect to every minister, thus legislates God out of the pulpits of his own ambassadors. Why, on such a principle not only may you not pray for objects or in a way that your brother "disapproves," (the relief of the oppressed or any other,) but you may not even preach "Christ and him crucified," if it be "against his will."

I anticipate the reply, "let him not go then into his brother's pulpit. His fault is, not in complying with his brother's will while there, but in consenting to go, when he knows that "will" will demand something at his hands, which he cannot conscientiously do, or omit to do." No, brethren, this does not meet the difficulty at all. The difficulty lies in the usage itself. What is the "right" asserted in your doctrine? Not that your brother has the right of private judgment on all questions of truth and duty, so far as himself is concerned. That is admitted. Not that, in the exercise of that right, it is his to invite or not invite whom he pleases to his pulpit. That is admitted. But more, that within the limits of his pulpit he may make his judgment his brother's. It is, that in God's creation there is a place, where one man, by virtue of his right of private judgment, may take that right from another, and make his will that other's supreme and absolute law. In other terms, that there is a place in the universe of being, in which one man may divest another (and if

another, himself) of his personal responsibility to God, and from which, for the time, "his will" may hence out God's will, as that other's law of action. Now this I utterly deny. The right of private judgment is yours, mine, every man's. It is as much and as sacredly one man's as it is another's. It is a part of our moral being, a constituent element in moral agency, and no more to be taken away, abjured, or put off, than moral agency itself. Go where I will, be where I may, do what I may, this right goes with me, and with it my responsibility to God; and in the wide universe there is no moment of time, no inch of space, no net of being, in which I may innocently put off that right, or forego its exercise, or in which my fellow can innocently take it from me. It is not mine to give, nor his to take. And if, by the condition on which he invites me to his pulpit, or any where else, he points me to a place where "his will" is to be supreme, he points me, 1st, to a place where, if I comply, I may not go, and 2nd, asserts a right, at war with the rights of God and man, and which I may in no form or sense admit or sanction, but on the contrary am bound to oppose and resist. If I go into his pulpit and comply with the condition, I sanction the right. If I stay out, and yet admit his right to impose the condition, I do the same. In either case, in the one as much as the other, I lead my sanction to the assertion of a right and the establishment of a usage destructive of personal responsibility and at war with the rights of God and man.

The only condition, if condition it can be called, on which I am at liberty to enter his pulpit is, conformity to his will in all things in which, in my judgment, not in his, his will conforms to God's. This is the condition of freedom. The other, is not only at war with the rights of God and man, but in its very nature, involves the vital elements of the worst forms of civil and ecclesiastical despotism, that have ever cursed the earth. The command of the Savior, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel," &c., is on you, and you are to preach it, not according to another man's judgment of it, but according to your own. To my pulpit, says your orthodox brother, provided you do nothing I "disapprove." To my empire, says Nicholas, and to mine, says the emperor of China, provided you do nothing I "disapprove." To my domain, says the Pope, provided you do nothing I "disapprove." And to my plantation, says the slaveholder, provided you do nothing "against my will." Only make "his will" law in each case, and preach the gospel, or do what you please, slaveholders, autocrats, emperors and popes will as promptly throw their arms wide open for your reception, fellowship and protection, as will your brother minister himself.

*The language of freedom is, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting (any where or at any time) the free exercise thereof." U. S. Con.

There is no despotism on earth, and can be none civil or ecclesiastical, to the very bottom of which, action on such a principle will not welcome you; and in the midst of which it will not make you feel at home, and leave you unmolested and protected. And why? Because the principle is itself the vital element of all despotism, and action on it is in harmony with them. The principle is the right of one man to make his will, for the time, supreme law for another. It is by virtue of this, and this only, that the slaveholder absorbs up, as it were, the very being of his slaves into himself, and makes "his will" the one all-pervading, omnipresent, all-controlling and absolute will of the plantation. It is by virtue of this, and this only, that the autocrat and the pope, do the same to a greater or less extent within the limits of their jurisdiction. And it is purely on this principle that the usage in question is founded. And therefore to declare as you have done, that, when in a brother's pulpit, you will never "do what you know he disapproves," but will in all cases make "his will" law, is just to say that you will sell your birthright; that you will for the time put off personal responsibility, give up the right of private judgment, and sell yourselves, the bond slaves of ecclesiastical usage, falsely so called.

It would be interesting to trace here the influence of your doctrine in the introduction of corruption to the church. A moment's thought will show you, I think, that it has been, in all ages of the church, the grand foster-mother of such corruption. I must not, however, enlarge.

What then is the true principle, and what the correct position on this subject of pastoral rights? The principle obviously is this; that every man, pastor or otherwise, has the right of private judgment on all questions of truth and duty; and that this right is never to be invaded or yielded. This single principle carried out and applied to all the parties, in each case, will solve all difficulties and lead to the following results.

1. That each pastor has the right to decide when, and what, and how he will preach himself, and who, and when, and how he will invite others to his pulpit. On all these points, his right of judgment is complete. And farther, elected as he is the chosen teacher of the people, his claim to the pulpit when he wishes to use it, and to their attention, takes precedence of (not excludes) all other claims. In these senses, the control of the pulpit is his.

2. That when he invites me to his pulpit, it is *me*, with my right of judgment, and not me with *his* right, that he invites. In other terms, it is *me* and not *himself*. Invitation on any other terms is invasion of my right of judgment.

3. That when invited, it is my duty, as a matter of courtesy and order, to do nothing in his pulpit "against his will," so far as I can in conscience do so, and no farther. To go farther would be to yield my right of judgment.

4. That if, in his pulpit, I feel myself in conscience bound to do or say things which I "know he disapproves," and so abuse, as he thinks, the confidence he has placed in me, he has "a proper way of dealing with" me—viz. to remonstrate with and convince me of my error if he can, and if he cannot, in the exercise of his right of judgment to invite me no more.

5. That if the pastor abuse his right in any of the respects named, "the people have a proper way of dealing with him"—viz. to remonstrate with and convince him of his error, if they can, and if they cannot, to dismiss him. In this way, in each of the above cases, the right of private judgment is left unimpeached to all the parties.

6. That the pastor's right to precedence, in the occupancy of the pulpit, and in his claims on the attention of the people, does not annihilate their right to hear whom else they please, and on what other subject they please. Their right of judgment on questions of truth and duty is as sacred as his. That right supposes on their part, as on his, the right to seek all the light on whatever subjects come before them, that is within their reach. If they deem it duty then, it is their right, when the pastor does not wish to use the pulpit himself, to invite into it whom they please and on what subject they please. To do so, is but an exercise of their right of private judgment, and is no invasion of his.

7. That when an individual, an agent or otherwise, goes into his, or rather into his people's pulpit, (for theirs it is when the minister is not using it,) it is his duty, as a matter of courtesy and order, and where circumstances render it possible, to call on the pastor and seek his advice, countenance and aid, in the particular object, whatever it be, of his address. If the pastor can second his errand, well. If not, then the question of proceeding devolves on him, and it is for him, in the exercise of his right of judgment, and on his responsibility to God, to say whether he will go on; and whichever way he decides the question, no man's right of judgment, neither his, the pastor's nor the people's is invaded, and no rightful ecclesiastical or civil order is disregarded.

8. That when called on by such individual, the pastor has the right and is bound to say for himself, whether he will or will not second him in his errand. If he says no, very well; it is his right, on his responsibility to God, to say so. If in saying so he makes a wrong decision, and so refuses to second an enterprise which he ought to second, the responsibility is his, and he, like every other man who does the same, is open to censure and rebuke.

9. That in the matter of notices, it is for the minister to say whether he will or will not give them. To deny this would be invasion of his right of judgment. If he refuses, it is for his people or the persons concerned, if they deem it duty, to repeat the requests and urge it even with the importunity of the poor widow, to blame him for a refusal, and if he will not give it at all, to give it themselves,